HARPER & BROTHERS, Publishers
49 East 33d Street, New York, N. Y.

Emmanuel Library
Emmanuel School of Religion
Route 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

David F. Curfman
Feb 25th 1929

Emmanuel Library
Emmanuel School of Religion
Route 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

SEEING THE FUTURE

SEEING THE FUTURE

BY

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST, LL.B.

AUTHOR OF "THE WORLD'S UNREST"

HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
MCMXXIX

CONTENTS

XVI. Signs of the Times: The Modern Policy of Nations 298
XVII. "Know Ye That the Kingdom of God is Nigh" 327

SEEING THE FUTURE

SEEING THE FUTURE

CHAPTER I

Seeing is Believing

Behold He cometh. . . .
And every eye shall see Him
REVELATION 1:7

SEEING is believing! This old saying holds good, not only in the homely things of daily life, but also in Science—and even in Religion.

The scientist makes "seeing is believing" his watchword. Though he deals nowadays with forces unseen and things invisible, he seeks to prove their existence and demonstrate their power in ways that are heard, felt, seen. He induces these mysteries to become sensibly manifest to witnesses. Scientific experiment is an appeal to the human senses, especially to the vision. When we hear, feel, and above all see, then we know: otherwise we will not, nor ought we to, believe. No theory of the scientist can be accepted on his

mere word. Its truth must be demonstrated by experiment, so that we can see for ourselves, or if not we in person, at least any or every qualified witness can see, can perform the experiment and report to us what he has seen. "Ultimately every observation can, of course, be reduced to our sense perceptions," as says Professor Nils Bohr. The delicate apparatus of the science laboratory is but an artificial aid to the human senses, which have not been deposed, by the many inventions of science, from their place of honour as judges of fact. The eye is still supreme in this regard. "What am I to *look* for?" Faraday used to ask, when an experiment was to be made in his presence. Seeing, and nothing but seeing, was believing to him! The same is true to-day of our ultra-modern scientists. However abstruse their experiment, its success is registered by the simple words: I see!

Religion, as well as science, must submit to this test. Christianity does so and hence the absurdity of the idea of a conflict between religion and science! Seeing is the foundation of Christian believing, for men *saw* Christ when He first came and they will *see* Him when He comes again. Meantime there is the visible evidence of prophecy in the act of being fulfilled. Thus Chris-

tianity is just as scientific as science itself, based as it is upon similar evidence. In fact, the concrete evidence for Christianity is fuller and less ambiguous than any that sustains the hypotheses we call science. At this very day, there is a renewal and increase of the concrete evidence for Christianity, which, if we will open them, our own eyes can see.

Before examining this evidence, it is well to explain what is here meant by Christianity. Certainly not that vague ideology which changes and sways to suit the passing breezes from scientific laboratories or philosophers' studies,—an ideology which makes vain pitiful compromise with mere hypotheses, and especially with one which is no longer even new and, as we shall see, already and increasingly abandoned by some men of science! That sort of Christianity is not modern enough for to-day! It has no vision, no promise for the future, and no explanation even of the present, with its trials and problems.

No provocation is intended here or anywhere in these pages, but indeed an ardent appeal that ecclesiastics of high position and great gifts will magnify their own office by holding firmly to their own, the one exact science, Theology,—and not

march at the tail of the other sciences, hypothetical and changeable as these admittedly are. We could not follow them backward to nineteenth century preoccupations and religio-scientific controversies dating from the far away sixties. Nor could we feel confidence in any religious doctrine, changing and chancing, minute by minute, to keep step with the ups and downs and ins and outs of modern scientific hypothesis. To square theology with nineteenth century science was attempted and then the twentieth century revolutionised science! In the last edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* it was necessary for Professor A. A. Millikan to deal with twenty-one fundamental discoveries originated within the short space of fifteen years, working a change in thought so stupendous, as he says, that hardly one basic idea about the nature of the universe, about matter and energy, about life and mind but has been transformed. Could theology make another new departure and come safely to terms once and for all with these new teachings of the other sciences? Not so, because these have just gone into the melting pot again. "The situation is rapidly becoming acute," says the author of a recent scientific work. He continues:

> "Since I began writing this essay, there has been a striking increase in critical activity, inspired by the new quantum mechanics. . . . The change in ideas is now so rapid that a number of the statements of this essay are already antiquated as expressions of the best current opinion." [1]

How mistaken, therefore, to base theology on the shifting foundation of natural science, which, for all its merits and marvels, is temporary and imperfect in its conclusions.

The Absolute of divine revelation, or the relativities of human hypothesis—which shall we account the more sure? The first, no less than the second, is evidenced by phenomena, and by objective and concrete phenomena. Revelation we find in the Bible. Human hypotheses are set forth in the various works of science, but we must beware of such as are out of date, for whereas ten years used to be mentioned as about the lifetime of scientific books, now it is very much shorter. Of modern scientific theories this at least can be said, that far from contradicting Biblical revelation, they are tending in its direction—the relative thus approximating, however distantly, to the absolute.

[1] *The Logic of Modern Physics,* P. W. Bridgman.

The Bible is now coming into its own again, as all can see who are not still dreaming the dreams of yester-century. The discoveries and the happenings of today are so many witnesses for the Bible. Here, for instance, is a very true saying found in a London newspaper:

> "The wonderful results of exploration in Bible lands will, in the course of the next year or two, restore the Old Testament to the position of importance which it held in this country before German materialism consigned it to the region of myth and legend."

The dogmas of the "higher" critics and the doctrine of the infallibility of science were the prime delusions of the defunct century. They linger yet, in minds that are *in* the twentieth century, but are not yet *of* it, but with what diminished force!

How the scientists of really modern spirit must smile at any laic idea that their splendid guesses at truth are pontifical: how they must marvel to see the doctrine of scientific infallibility still haunting the halls of theology! As for the dogmas of "Higher" Criticism, these are shot to pieces by a fire directed from more than one quarter, "higher" critical methods and conclusions be-

ing repudiated in the matter whether of history, or of ancient tradition, or of the Bible itself.

Looking back upon "Higher" Criticism of the Bible, we see how obtuse were the critics who suddenly developed an incapacity to see great truths that had been plain enough, until then, to mightier and more original minds than theirs. Yet with all this blindness to major issues, they displayed a microscopic vision and a detective scent in their avid hunt, their restless searching, whether by any means they might find even the smallest inaccuracy of detail in the wondrous Book. The fact is that a better sense of proportion in reading the Bible would have saved much vain disputation these many years, but under the baneful influence of a regrettably negative criticism, folk lost sight of the wood for the trees. Instead of studying the Bible as the organic whole that it is, despite the plurality of pens that committed it to writing, they broke it up, shook and scattered the bits, and then proceeded as though each part were greater than the whole.

Quite lately, protest was made by a writer in *Antiquity,* the quarterly review of Archæology, against "Higher" Criticism's destructive attack upon the epics of Homer, made, to quote the protester, with "no benevolent intent, but rather with

a determination to prove unreality and romance." However, in the contest between archæology and the "Higher" Criticism, archæology will inevitably have the last word, and the writer in *Antiquity* triumphantly declares that "excavation has revealed much of the reality of which Homer sings." He concludes his article with these forcible words:

> "Recent discoveries are helping us to a view of the Homeric age and life as real and historical, and have rescued the epics from the Bolshevistics of the Higher Criticism of last century."

There, for the present, we may leave the "Higher" Criticism, with the remark that if Homer's epics are unscathed by its "Bolshevistics," even more unscathed is the Bible.

World storm is blowing up, so men fear, clouds are lowering, and there are sounds like thunder, the air is heavy with menace. Thankful let us be that, in such an hour, the Bible, unshaken, undefaced, is with us to encourage, to enlighten, to announce the calm to follow storm and the coming again of One who in His reign will veritably be

> ". . . As the light of the morning when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds;

as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain."[1]

The grand, compelling theme of the Bible, sounding clearer, fuller, and in ever lovelier harmony as it advances to its climax, is the Lord Jesus Christ. The Bible is the history of Christ, all other persons dealt with in its pages being subsidiary. Here, as in the many-peopled romance of some great novelist, one character is chief and centre of the rest.

The Hero of the Bible is Christ. He is predicted in the Old Testament. He is present in the New Testament, which in its turn predicts Him in His second coming. He links together the two Testaments. The career of Christ is the vertebral column of the Bible, all other parts being articulated in due relation thereto. The Bible, we may as well repeat, is an organic whole. It is, first and last, the book about Christ.

What Christ is this? Not simply a human being! We read, *outside* the Bible, about one Jesus who was a good man, indeed, the very best man who has ever lived so far, who was in closer communion with God and more fully expressed the divine purpose for mankind than any other has yet done, but this Jesus was not himself actually

[1] 2 Samuel 23:4.

God. *Inside* the Bible we find no such Jesus. On the contrary, we find a Jesus "the Christ the Son of the Blessed," a Jesus who claims to be God. He so surely and certainly and historically pronounced Himself to be God, that He was accused of blasphemy and accounted liable to the penalty of death, because that He, being a man, made Himself out to be God.[1]

Considering that every single thing we know about this same Jesus we find in the Bible, *and nowhere but the Bible,* we obviously cannot invent, out of our head, a story of our own of who He is and what He said and did; we must accept Him as we find Him in the Bible. Nor can we pick out the bits in the Bible that tell of His manhood and reject or ignore those that tell of His godhead. Entirely imaginary and wholly impossible, unreal, unconvincing is this Jesus, who they say was perfect man but not very God of very God.

A Jesus Christ who is not God and so cannot wield the power of God, would be totally unable to do for the world what needs to be done. Yet again, even the Jesus who is God could not, merely by words, teaching, example, take away the sin of the world—the decisive deed of the Cross is as indispensable as it is plainly of Biblical record.

[1] St. John 10:33.

Finally, this Jesus "our great God and Saviour" must do even more than He yet has done—the sorrow and violence in this modern world prove that. He must, as He promised, come back. He must take His great power and reign.

Now for the scientific evidence that this great event will really happen!

CHAPTER II

The Importance of Prophecy

VERIFIED prediction supplies scientific proof of Christianity.

Verified prediction is, as we all know, the strongest kind of scientific proof. The "What am I to *look* for?" of Faraday meant also *"What* am I to look for?" and challenged a brother scientist to prophesy first, before his experiment performed his prophecy and thereby proved his case. Einstein's ability to make prediction afterwards fulfilled by the event moved the scientific world to acceptance of the theorising that enabled his predicting. When a scientist can make his hypothesis "the basis of a prediction of the way in which something will happen in Nature and when such a theoretical prediction is later verified, the proof of the hypothesis from which it has been deduced is highly conclusive." [1] And this proof, the same in kind and even higher in degree, exists for Christianity. Because the Bible has

[1] *Illustrations of the Methods of Reasoning—A Source Book in Logic and Scientific Method.*

predicted the facts about Christ; of its predictions many have been fulfilled already and the rest, according to present signs, are not far from fulfilment. Away with the "old fogeyism" and superannuated prejudice that affected to disdain Biblical prophecy, while open-mouthed to swallow the most startling biological or other hypotheses! The plain facts of verified Biblical prediction cannot any longer be ignored. Prophecy must be reckoned with, for the simple reason that in these days, as nineteen hundred years ago, the fulfilment of prophecy has in a special and conspicuous manner resumed its course.

Amateurs of the sciences, and such we all are nowadays, resolute to keep up with the very latest ideas in those realms, should take at least equal pains to discern the present signs of the times, as they prove the prescience of the God who has told us beforehand that these signs would appear. Verifiable prediction as scientific method was first resorted to by God, long before our human scientists were born or thought of.

As proof of His revelation, God offers prediction which He knows will be fulfilled.

As proof of his hypothesis, the scientist offers prediction which he believes, or at any rate hopes, will be fulfilled.

The scientist says: That you may see whether or no my hypothesis is sound, I predict to you, on the basis thereof, that such and such will happen.

God says: That you may know that I am God and my word is true, I predict to you things that will happen. "For I am God . . . and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done."[1]

The scientific method of proof is the same. All the difference is that God's revelation is absolute, its verification sure, while the human hypothesis is relative and not necessarily the sole or best explanation of the facts—thus Einstein's own followers are by this time expressing reserves and moving amendments to his teaching. We already hear, too, that "the early conception of the electron cannot be adequate."[2] But the promise of Christ, sum and substance of Biblical prophecy, is absolute from the beginning, and its fulfilment has so far been exact, concrete and without any ambiguity—in a word, conclusive. . . .

"The final touchstone is equal validity for all normally constituted minds," to quote Professor

[1] Isaiah 46:9, 10.

[2] Sir Joseph Thomson, Professor of Physics, Cambridge University.

Karl Pearson on scientific proof. Here again, Biblical prophecy shows itself truly scientific, because the things which are prophesied and performed are of equal validity for, and can be equally perceived by, all normally constituted minds. Prophecy, that is to say, is fulfilled objectively.

Christianity is the objective religion, being based on facts that are, or will be, matters of common knowledge. These basic facts of Christianity are indicated in its Founder's words: "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, in the psalms and in the prophets concerning me." There are three strands of prophecy in process of fulfilment. The one concerns Christ himself: the others concern the Jewish and Gentile peoples respectively—a three-ply rope of fact. The truth of Christianity is thus attested by historical experience. This is a much surer ground of belief than the mysticism which finds favour, in some very "modern" quarters, under the name of "Christian experience" or "religious experience." The private intuitions of individuals, whose experiences are, it seems, not necessarily the same, cannot be compared for validity with the universal revelation given in the Bible and processively and publicly confirmed by history.

We are not all mystics—some of us are very far indeed from being so. Well, for us, then, that Christianity is founded upon plain evidence that can be understood by such ordinary, matter-of-fact people as ourselves! Well for us that this evidence brings within our ken the very mystery of godliness—God manifest in flesh! . . .

"Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," says the Apostle, but his faith was very solidly grounded upon concrete, objective fact. It was *interim*-faith—faith bridging the interval of time between the first advent of the Lord Jesus Christ and his return. All the long history of their race, as well as the visible facts of the Lord's first appearing, had evidenced to the apostles that what the Bible announces will literally come true. So their faith was not against, or independent of, knowledge and reason, but was founded upon these. Beginning thus in sight, their *interim*-faith reached forward to sight. In the meantime, their communion with Christ was with one who still retained his objective reality, though he was withdrawn from the sight of their eyes. Theirs was not faith, as opposed to knowledge, in something that knowledge could not compass. They had much stronger, first-hand reason for their knowledge concerning Christ,

than people have now for believing certain scientific statements whose truth they have not the ability to test for themselves. Faith, in apostolic parlance, primarily means trust in a Person whose existence, nature, attributes, and power are evidentially known. Faith and reason do not differ in Christianity, because they both say the same thing. There is no distinction between revelation and rational knowledge, because the second confirms the first. It is untrue that God, as we have seen it somewhere written, "cannot in the nature of the case be brought within the system of rational knowledge." The Incarnation has brought God within the sphere of rational knowledge, as have His predictions, historically fulfilled, which demonstrate His presence and power. "Who hath declared from the beginning, that we may know? and beforetime, that we may say, He is righteous?" [1]

One is repelled from the neo-mystic way by the statement, found in a disquisition on religious experience, that: "The notion of truth, as correspondence of an idea with a reality behind it, falls away." This is preceded by the assurance that the "validity" of religious beliefs may be broadly tested by the way in which they "fulfil the religious

[1] Isaiah 41:26.

nature and work within the historic religious life." Pragmatic, very! But hardly sufficing! Some of us, again, are so constituted that we prefer the notion of truth as correspondence of an idea with a *reality* behind it and cannot be satisfied with anything else or less! Some day—the sooner the better—the sublime Reality will show himself again. Then the cry will go up: Behold he cometh with clouds—and every eye shall see him. . . . Then it will, for the first time, dawn upon some intelligences that eyes have been given to men, not so much that they may see sky, earth, and water, not so much that they may see one another—but that they may see God! . . .

Just a few more links of fulfilled prophecy remain to be added by coming events, and the chain will be complete! Already it is so long and strong and so publicly evident, as to enable that "co-operative tendency toward consensus which marks enquiry in the natural sciences," to borrow the words, used in another connection by a logician, who further points to the contrast between "a claim to a private access to truth" and the "enlightenment and guidance" which may be derived from "the things of common experience." [1]

The common experience of religious truth is

[1] *Experience and Nature,* John Dewey.

in store for the world, because the real, the objective Christ will be universally seen and known at his second advent. At present, not only does materialistic unbelief depend upon his invisibility, but there are many people, not having a tendency to scepticism, who rely upon their own personal conception of who or what Christ is or should be. As a result, many and various Christs are spoken of. Merely subjective impressions will give way at the return of the objective Christ. As will then be demonstrated, he exists in entire independence of human subjectivity. Before we were, he is. He would be if we had never been. . . .

Religious unity is an ideal of the modern world, which is yet so divided in religious belief and experience. William James, after examining their many varieties, was fain to desire that religion should be transformed into a universally convincing science! So it will be, at "the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

There is a yearning of many, in these times, to behold God; hence a certain tendency to mysticism. This, however, does not necessarily lead to the same conclusion. There are mystics of different religions. Mystics are not unanimous, reports William James, though he observes an inclina-

tion toward pantheism,—"the mystic range of consciousness is on the whole pantheistic,"—and he even makes mention of a mysticism of diabolism. Furthermore, mystic states of consciousness and trance-like states, he reports, are not without their dangers as avenues to truth, even if the truth were surely to be found at their end. A hostile witness this, it may be said, but a friendly witness has since also said that religion of the mystical type is not confined to Christianity or any one religion, and has further admitted that there are mystical experiences which are "abnormal and pathological" and that they "may stretch over all degrees from the most perfect sanity to utter disorganisation of the self." Such risks most people are quite determined not to run. The prophets themselves were sometimes in an extraordinary state of consciousness, it may be said, but the point is that their visions communicated facts, which in due time could be checked and verified by persons in a normal state of consciousness. Quite contrariwise is it with our neo-mystics, and the same friendly witness, just quoted, admits that "we cannot with implicit confidence leap to the conclusion that every instance of so-called mystical experience furnishes us with a sure clue to the God whom our eager souls seek," and that

"it is useless to claim that mystical experiences have such ontological bearing that they settle for *everybody* the reality of God." While acknowledging the weakness of subjective experience, the writer quoted expresses the despairing conviction that no empirical evidence of any sort can ever answer the question whether there is in the universe a God who is personal and all-loving! He is wrong! There is, and still more there *will* be, empirical evidence of the presence in the universe of a God who is personal and all-loving. "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." [1] The prophesied coming to the world of the Son of God, in His past and future advents—in this consists the empirical evidence of Christianity. The challenge of one sceptic is that the Christian revelation should be a matter "not of private faith, but of public certainty." The fulfilment of prophecy is moving to that end, because when Jesus Christ returns, every eye, all kindreds of the earth, will publicly and certainly behold and know Him.

[1] I John 4:9.

CHAPTER III

The Discovery of the Future

WHAT is the world coming to? When an anxious generation that has managed to survive the worst of wars, but is not too sure of escaping another war still more awful, asks this question of the scientists, what is the answer? Some say they know no more than the rest of humankind, since one law of nature, at least,—the law of *human* nature,—they cannot formulate, and an even more important factor of the problem is beyond their scientific technique, namely, the future ways of God with man. Other scientists, by way of a crumb of comfort, cheerily add that anyhow there is a long, if not a good time coming—that this planet has ahead of it, one has said quite modestly, "several hundred million years" and another, more bold, has said "a million million years." But what will *happen* in the time to come? is the query of the plain person, who fears that if wars and revolutions continue, and the means of making them deadly increase, human civilisation may collapse and hu-

manity may even become as extinct as the dodo, long before the longest time limit expires. The scientists themselves warn us of this, saying, as one did the other day:

> "Somewhat careless of consequences, Science is opening Pandora's box, and from it come all the evils that afflict mankind and all the blessings that enrich it. Let us hope that, as our knowledge grows, wisdom may increase also."

No! modern science has not solved the riddle of the future.

Though *Time* now engages much of their thinking, modern scientists, even if they can tell us what time is, do not tell us what time has in store—do not tell us what the world is coming to. Yet some scientists have known and told this, because they found the future pre-written in a manual whose scientific worth has been proved by repeated verification of its predictions. In the learned world there have not been greater figures than Newton and Pascal and none whose influence has been so long lasting, for both are as though they still lived among us. The celebration of Newton's bicentenary gave new occasion to extol his scientific grandeur, his unchallenged

supremacy of genius. Newton's universal mind moved far beyond the borders of his specialised scientific interests, vast as these were, and brought him to the veiled realm of the future. Recognising the limitations of human experimental science, in which he was yet so mighty a master, he went to the only other possible source of knowledge, the Bible, and there, in its prophecies, he discovered the future. When Newton lived, the signs of the times were not what they are in our day, and he was therefore dependent upon long past fulfilments of prophecy, but these were enough to convince him that the rest would follow, and that a future generation would see the promised return of Christ to set up the Kingdom of God. Of things as they stood in his own time, he wrote:

> "There is already so much of the prophecy fulfilled that as many as will take the pains may see sufficient evidence of God's providence."

Looking onward to the future crisis of history he added:

> "But then the signal revolutions predicted by all the holy prophets, will at once turn

men's eyes upon considering the predictions and plainly interpreting them."

Consider who and what he was who wrote thus! "Newton was the greatest man of science the world has ever seen," says Sir J. J. Thomson, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of Physics in the University. The secretary of the Royal Society, Dr. J. H. Jeans, calls Newton "the greatest man of science, perhaps the greatest intellect the human race has seen," and quotes Laplace as saying that Newton's *Principia* has assured to it for all time "a pre-eminence above all other productions of the human intellect." This Newton, the man whom past and present generations of men of scientific genius have delighted to honour as greater than them all, affirmed as a scientific fact of the future that the Lord Jesus Christ will come again in his kingdom. Newton, says Dr. J. H. Jeans, was not only "the greatest genius that ever was" but also "the most fortunate, for as there is but one universe there can be but one man in the world's history to be the interpreter of its laws." Too narrow for Newton was any theory of the universe which neglected its Creator. Incomplete and therefore false, thought the great scientist,

was any interpretation of the laws by which God governs the universe, if it neglected His purpose to bring into one all things in Christ and to reduce chaos—whether in Nature, nations or human hearts—to order, by making Christ regnant in his visible, majestic, glorious appearing. The fall of an apple or the fulfilment of a prophecy—evidence was evidence to Newton, "with his stupendous mental grasp and breadth, his capacity for seeing all aspects of a question and so making unerringly the choice between alternatives which have seemed equally probable to a lesser mind." [1] This prince of scientists has answered the question that finds so many dumb—what the world is coming to is, according to Newton, the return of Christ and the Kingdom of God.

"Distinguished among distinguished men of all times, rises the figure of Pascal." [2] To his compatriots, Pascal is as a modern among moderns. The Société des Amis de Pascal, whose president is M. Paul Bourget of the Académie Française, holds periodical gatherings in Paris, and at one of these M. Bourget paid tribute to Pascal, remarking that writings about him are multiplying and by their ardour attesting that the author of the *Pensées* is still as modern and as living in his

[1] Dr. Jeans. [2] Dr. Harold Höffding.

influence now as when Voltaire wrote his *Remarques sur les Pensées,* "with a passion which proved how fully his destructive genius recognised the conservating and creative power of the Pascalian argument." The very foundation of this Société des Amis de Pascal, the speaker went on, proves his actuality. "Pascal, it has been said, still stands erect among the ruins of his century," but, declared M. Bourget, he also stands erect among the ruins of the scientism (as distinct from science) of the nineteenth century," for two reasons, "among so many others," which explain his "persistent prestige" and "enable us to affirm that its action is not near to being exhausted." The first of these reasons, according to M. Bourget, is that Pascal has stated "with singular force and precision the problem of science of which scientism so proudly claimed to give the solution. There are in man two needs, to know and to understand. Pascal saw that to know does not mean to understand. The error of scientism consists in believing that there is only one method of arriving at certitude. The stroke of genius of Pascal was to recognise that there are several, because reality includes phenomena irreducible the one to the other." . . . The word science ought not, on Pascalian principles, continued M. Bourget, and

how sound is his word,—to be used in the singular unless immediately followed by another word showing precisely what science is in question, for we cannot speak of Science with a capital S, but only of sciences. "The biological world exists and its study requires a method distinct from that which concerns the physico-chemical world. . . . The division of the orders of knowledge is the doctrine of Pascal." Again, Pascal is "actual," says M. Bourget, because he knew and described human nature as it is and "denounced with a striking realism the inconsequences of utopists who do not see, as said another great observer of the same line, 'that the most civilised people is as near to barbarism as the most polished steel is to rust.'" . . . Another present-day writer, in praise of Pascal's modernity, says: "It is related that Bismarck had the works of Bonald as his bedside book. I do not believe that I am the dupe of my admiration for Pascal in saying that the *Pensées* ought to be the bedside book of every statesman worthy of that name, as of every legislator, of every educator and, I will add, of every writer."

Good! Because that great book, so up to date and indispensable to the world's leaders, foretells the future, arguing and proving that Christ is

coming back visibly, powerfully, gloriously to reign. This great mathematician-philosopher, this man who, as another modern writer admiringly observes, "lived in a perpetual state of research and discovery," discovered the future exactly where Newton did, in the prophecies of the Bible. His scientific mind appreciated at its true value the verification, in historic experience, of a large part of prophecy, and he drew therefrom the reasoned conclusion that all the rest would be fulfilled. "The heart has its reasons that reason knoweth not," as Pascal believed, but he believed that reason has its reasons too, and that both point forward to the goal of prophecy fulfilled. The nephew of Pascal reported thus the great man's way of expounding matters:

> "He undertook to prove the truth of religion by the prophecies: on this subject he dwelt very much more extensively than upon the others. . . . He explained them in a highly intelligible manner: made evident their sense and sequence with a marvellous facility: he brought to light all their meaning and all their force."

"The prophecies," says Pascal, "are the strongest proofs of Jesus Christ." Showing how strong

this proof is, he, as a mathematician, adds that if one man alone had made a book of predictions concerning Jesus Christ and "Jesus Christ had come in agreement with these prophecies, the fact would have had infinite force." But, Pascal urges, in this case there is much more, for here is a succession of prophets who, without interruption or variation, follow one another in foretelling the same event, and here is a whole people announcing it, existing to testify in a body their certainty from which they cannot be divided. This, as he points out, is "in a far greater degree important."

Apart from the revelation of the Bible, authenticated for us as it is by the historic proofs of fulfilled prediction, Pascal sees mankind as ignorant of essential truths, and pictures the whole dumb universe and man without light, left to himself and lost as it were in this corner of the universe, not knowing who placed him there, what he has come to do, what will become of him when he dies, and incapable of any knowledge whatever. . . . How many see the same picture in crises of their lives, and above all in the times of world uncertainty, when illusion wears thin and the mere *joie de vivre* tends to fail! "I see oth-

ers about me," says Pascal, "and I ask them if they are better informed than I am and they say they are not. . . . I seek to discover whether there is not something more than is visible to me, whether God has not left some impress of Himself." Pascal pursues his quest, and we read on. "I see many contrary religions and consequently all false but one:"—here speaks the mathematician-philosopher—"each wishes to be believed on its own authority, but I do not therefore believe them. Everyone can say the same and everyone can call himself a prophet. But I see the Christian religion *fulfilling* prophecy and that is what everyone cannot do."

Israel's prophets heralded the Messiah who should visit Jew and Gentile both. The prophets, Pascal reminds us, bore witness to Him, at the same time foretelling other things which, being from time to time fulfilled in the eyes of all, demonstrated the truth of their mission, and consequently that of their greater and more distant promises touching Messiah. In the fulness of time Jesus Christ came and, the prophecies being so far accomplished, the Messiah is forever proved—so says the reason of Pascal. Then from his heart springs this word:

> "So I stretch out my arms to my Redeemer, who having been foretold for four thousand years, came to suffer and to die for me on earth as foretold."

And as surely and as really as He came that first time, He will come again, asserts Pascal, upon the same evidence. Of this, His second advent, he says:

> "It is to be glorious and so manifest that even His enemies will recognise it."

The Middle Ages, it has been said, had a philosophy, but had not science, while this modern day has science but no longer a philosophy. Pascal and Newton were pre-eminent in having both. It is from these two high watch-towers that shines forth the signal: Christ will come again.

CHAPTER IV

The Fact of Divine Intervention

THERE are tides in the fulfilment of prophecy. A new tide is rising now and, there are reasons to believe, the *high tide!*

Between tides, men easily forget or despise the prophecies. Modern mankind has done so—as did the ancients before them, for in the Old Testament we read:

> "What is that proverb that ye have in the land of Israel, saying, The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth? Tell them therefore, Thus saith the Lord God: I will make this proverb to cease . . . the word that I shall speak shall come to pass." [1]

The great length of time, humanly measured, since the mighty tide of the First Advent and soon-following events of 70 A.D., has been made a pretext for neglecting prophecy.

Besides, it became all the fashion—a fashion reaching its height in the past sixty years—to

[1] Ezekiel 12:22, 23, 25.

36379

think that mankind could achieve its own perfection, create its own millennium, be its own God!

Theology was made a branch of anthropology.

Man, it was eventually declared by some, is before God, for God is not yet evolved!

The Universe was supposed to have "just growed" by mere "natural" process and simply of its own accord. The modern world had forgotten the fact that God, at His own times and seasons, makes direct and special intervention in the affairs of Creation, but the signs of these times and their already marvellous correspondence with the prophecies of the Bible, have effectually roused people of discernment to remember their Creator and all His mighty working from the beginning of all things, as well as to expect the divine Visitant who will return to pacify and purify the ways of nations and of nature.

Divine intervention is a fact, the great interventions of God being first creative, next redemptive, afterwards regnant. Historically, the special creative and redemptive interventions are past, whereas the regnant intervention is still in the future, though in the near future, judging by the increasing signs and portents of the coming of Christ to reign. Certain modernist theologians still argue, to quote one of them, that "there is

no reason to expect the return of Jesus in the clouds of heaven," but the facts are against them, because the signs that He said would herald His coming are multiplying all round us. Besides, what is the alternative to His coming, what other prospect of having the Kingdom of God upon earth! Some modernist preachers are trusting to some automatic process which they term evolution, but let it be remembered that upon the theory of that same automatic process have been based such materialist notions as the non-existence of the soul, with the denial of immortality, and the non-existence of God Himself. In however spiritual a sense the doctrine of evolution be understood, it is evident that special divine intervention is needed, because all the processes of nature and human nature are tainted with evil, as witnessed by the whole history of the world and by the serious events and conditions of this modern day. To cure this evil requires the direct personal intervention of the divine Lord of Creation. No mere natural process of development or evolution is enough—for as experience shows it is liable to retrogression, to checks and to failures and hence the necessity of the promised strong, perfect and speedy intervention of the Son of God.

God works slowly, gradually, they say. Yes, but, on occasion, He also works swiftly, suddenly, and performs decisive acts at great turning points of history, human and divine.

This generation must take serious heed of prophecy because the climax of its fulfilment is near. The old-fashioned scepticism is out of place today. Many of us used to be doubters and were mildly amused by those simple souls, as we thought them, who saw, before we did, that Bible prophecy has a practical application to modern times. Wiser have we grown since then, because ten years' careful study of current world events in the light of prophecy have convinced us that prophecy is true and true for our own days. Prophecy is proved beyond a peradventure, to those who have considered the evidence. The pity of it is that so many refuse to do this and persist in thinking that to ignore prophecy in relation to present events and conditions is a mark of intelligence and education. Yet they will most readily believe any human theory provided it comes from a scientist and they will believe it on evidence much slighter and more indirect than the historical evidence that supports prophecy. Their erroneous belief that world evils such as immorality, crime and war and all man's inhumanity to

man will vanish without divine intervention and by some more or less automatic natural process, is based upon the scientific theory of Darwin but Darwinism even is being challenged today in common with all other scientific doctrines. In its original materialistic acceptation it has been copiously watered, and as a matter of fact *drowned dead,* by such notions as "creative evolution," and "emergent evolution." *"Creative* evolution"—the very expression is absolutely heretical from the standpoint of Darwin and of Huxley, who write, for example: "If Canon X more clearly appreciated the great gulf fixed between the ideas of creation and evolution. . . ."

"Emergent evolution"—this term would have been condemned by these orthodox Darwinians, as would the views of its exponent, Professor Lloyd Morgan. Contrast these two statements and see how the one contradicts the other!

DARWIN	Prof: LLOYD MORGAN
"As natural selection acts solely by accumulating slight successive favourable variations, it can produce no great or sudden modifica-	"The advance of Nature which brings with it really new features is by steps or by leaps and not by sliding over

tions; it can act only by slow or short steps. Hence the canon of 'Natura non facit saltum' which every fresh addition to our knowledge tends to confirm, is on this theory intelligible."[1]

changes. In the broad domain of nature leaps are many, so many that I have ventured on occasion to speak of the advance of nature as fundamentally jumpy."

It is of the essence of the Darwinian dogma that "Nature does not jump," and here come these "Emergentists," daring innovaters who defy this now venerable dogma by their heretical affirmation: "And yet it *does* jump!" Before we know it, if such inroads continue upon last century's evolutionary revelation, according to Darwin, Huxley, and Haeckel, science will find itself landed once more upon the rock of Emergent Creation, according to the book of Genesis!

Scientific critics of even its more modern developments include Professor D'Arcy Thompson who remarks "even strong and apparently complex resemblances in form may be capable of arising independently."[2] Darwinism, he suggests,

[1] *The Origin of Species.*
[2] *Form and Function,* D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson.

inclines to consider organisms as a collection of parts rather than as a whole.

The evidence of fossil remains is "distinctly unfavourable," says the author of *Form and Function*,[1] to the schemes constructed by the "devotees of evolutionary morphology," and he adds that as Neumayer, Zittel, Dépéret, Steinmann, and others have pointed out, the palaeontological record gives remarkably little support to ideal genealogies worked out by morphologists. There is, he continues, "a striking absence of transition forms between the great classificatory groups" which are "almost as distinct in early fossiliferous strata as they are at the present day." The same witness proceeds:

> "Nature, as Cuvier pointed out, has not had recourse to all possible forms and combinations of organs; she appears to work with a limited number of types and to get the greatest possible diversity out of these by varying the proportions of the constitutive materials and structure. Within the limits of each type, nature has brought about diversity by raising her creatures to different degrees of perfection."

[1] E. S. Russell, F.Z.S.

An American scientist Professor W. R. Thompson, Director of the European Parasite Laboratory of the United States of America.[1] As an expert in the matter, he comments on the argument that parasitic phenomena supply "indirect proof of evolution," saying:

> "Too often it happens that biologists are not content to make a purely scientific study of evolution. They often claim to draw from facts a general evolutionary doctrine, which is, or would be, a veritable philosophy of nature; with most of them their account of scientific facts is impregnated with the very doctrine which the facts themselves are supposed to prove."

With regard to adaptive changes seen in Nature, supervening as reactions to change of environment, he points out that "what are regarded by systematicians as specific differences, may sometimes, or indeed often, be only the morphological expressions of the reactions of *the same specific nature* to different environments."

Belief in evolution is as much, if not more, an act of faith as is belief in creation as set forth in the Bible—so says an Italian scientist who finally

[1] An article in *Les Cahiers de Philosophie de la Nature.*

sums up his conclusions to this effect. Before the origin of organisms, there was the origin of the world, of the whole solar system. Again the same dilemma: either you must accept the Mosaic cosmogony or else take seriously the hypothesis of Laplace, although this is in disaccord with the laws of mechanics, and other hypotheses, alternative to his, are not more fortunate. Biology has not penetrated to the origins of organisms, and the history of this science proves that grand theories and general hypotheses are not helpful to it: biological problems are so complex that the biologist must be on his guard against such facile and simple solutions as that offered by the dogma of evolution.

Just another warning, all this, against building upon the ever varying hypothesis of human science!

Embryology has been said to supply a main proof of Darwinism, but Professor Vialleton, in his *Critique du Transformisme,* puts the other side of the question and, opposing the evolutionist idea that ancestral forms are recapitulated in the development of the embryo, declares that what really takes place is "a succession of forms which is necessary to the development of the embryo and is not at all an ancestral repetition." The first

forms (*ébauches*) of the embryo cannot, he pursues, represent ancestral organs, because no ancestral organ could exist with the known constitution of these ébauches, for these are absolutely incapable of functioning otherwise than as constituent parts of the embryo, playing, as such, a part necessary to the development of the whole. The embryonic ébauches are parts necessary to the anatomical development of living beings and are not ancestral forms repeated in souvenir of the past. The argument proceeds: The young embryos of superior animals resemble only the embryos of inferior animals and do not at all resemble the adult state of the lower animals. In other words, all the vertebrates have common organic rudiments during a very short stage of their embryonic life and they resemble each other at that moment by these ébauches, regarded separately, though not by their form as a whole, which is already different in the divers types of embryos and forbids any confusion between them. But in consequence of a defective interpretation of these ébauches considered separately, a confusion has arisen which has led to the making of an unwarranted genealogical rapprochement between them. . . . Thus, *embryonic mechanism*

has been confounded with supposed ancestral repetitions.

Discussing the limitations of comparative anatomy as an argument for Darwinism, Professor Vialleton remarks that the homologies of skeletic pieces have sometimes been founded in a very insufficient manner. There is often represented a series going from the front leg of the tortoise to the arm of man, passing, by way of other forms, including the wing of a bird, the fin of a cetacean and the paws of mammals, these members being shown *separated* from their girdles and, as is not the case in nature, *all orientated in the same fashion.* This takes no account of the fact that what is realisable with the dry bones of a skeleton is not necessarily so when there are muscles and ligaments to limit the movements of the limbs. Certain phenomena that have been imagined in the name of comparative anatomy would be impossible in the complete living animals in question. The habit of not taking account of the ensemble and notably of the orientation of members and the conditions of functioning of their various segments, has led to certain imperfect palaeontological reconstitutions which "fully justify the remark of Carazzi who wonders what would be the stupefaction of many palaeontolo-

gists, if they could see in flesh and blood the animals which they think they have perfectly reconstructed." Man is a vertical mammal, and this very special attitude, says Professor Vialleton, "makes of him an independent type as isolated, in reality, from his alleged neighbours, as flying or pisciform mammals are from ordinary ones, many of his anatomical characteristics are very close to those of the Primates . . . but when one reflects upon the very special formula of the relative growth of the parts required by his structure, it appears as clearly separated as we have said, and his locomotor apparatus accords entirely with his cerebral and psychic development, making him truly a type apart." Dwelling upon the differences between the human skeleton, the professor explains that he is not speaking of skeletons of apes in museums, arranged in human posture, "the arms and legs being often in a vertical position which they never could have achieved when alive, with the ligaments and muscles still in place," and adds that there are reconstructions of fossils which must be received with some scepticism as being "a concession, more or less conscious, to the idea of required intermediaries between man and the anthropoids."

"We are still," says the Professor, "face to face

with the persistence and distinctness of types of organisation and with the fact that a living being never engenders others that do not very closely resemble it, or that do not belong to the same formal type of organisation." Here is the conclusion of the matter, as this witness sees it:

> "The different types of animal organisation persist with an incredible fixity."

But whatever the final view of the scientists, the fact remains that Darwinism or even a less materialist sort of evolution could never of itself be enough, and Divine intervention is the supreme hope and way of deliverance from sin and sorrow.

CHAPTER V

Christianity and the Younger Generation

"I will come again. . . .
If it were not so, I would have told you."

THIS is the open secret of the future, the hope of the new age. Christ will come again: would He have said so if He had not known it? A prophet and much more than a prophet was He. Happily so for us, because we can read in His predictions the happy ending of the sad story of this present age of history, whose evils we who are now living have seen at boiling point. Even since the great war ended, the "witches' caldron" has never been covered again, has never cooled, but still simmers threateningly. Rumours of wars and civil wars and human unrest in every form, with upheavals of nature, mark the past decade as, indeed, they have marked the centuries before it, but with concentrated force. All exactly as Christ foretold! Nineteen hundred years ago, in the days of the Pax Romana, when war was "outlawed" by the Roman power and

outlawed, as Roman citizens may have thought, forever, Christ, with His divine foreknowledge, foretold[1] the coming wars and tumults of the historic age which began when He was born in Bethlehem and will end when He comes the second time in His power and glory to bring the Kingdom of God to earth. In His prophetic history of this age, we see the nations (still, when He spoke, bound together in the great Empire), foreshown as the distinct nations they afterwards became, rising, as too truly they subsequently did, in an age-long sequence of wars, "nation against nation and kingdom against kingdom." The prophetic picture is to the very life! It shows wars and rumours of wars, disfiguring the present era as a whole but reaching their climax as this era itself draws to a close. Exactly what is happening! Contrary to human prediction, but conformable to divine prediction, this modern day has seen the worst war there has ever been and since it ended the nations have prepared still more devastating means of warfare. . . .

"But before all these things," before the opening of the long tale of wars, before their climax and Christ's own return, certain definite things would happen and, in historic fact, have hap-

[1] Gospel according to St. Luke, chapter 21.

pened. The disciples would be laid hold on, imprisoned, persecuted. Jerusalem would be compassed with armies and there would be great distress in the land and wrath upon the people—"and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles . . ."

All was fulfilled to the letter. Thus, not only was the general outline and colour of this whole era correctly foreshown, but also a definite historic crisis. And not that one crisis only, but also a second mightier crisis, which is still to come. Read again: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until*"—until when?—"until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled!"

Here is the name, the "Times of the Gentiles," for a definite historic period. As we should speak, for instance, of the Tudor period, so the Jews spoke of the times of the Gentiles—meaning the duration of the Gentile régime, beginning with the downfall of the Davidic Kingdom of Judah, and lasting until that still future day when the throne and Kingdom of David will be restored. This restoration will, they have believed from the beginning, be quite as real and historic as, to take as an example some historic parallel,

the restoration of the Stuarts at the end of the Protectorate. With what a difference, however, for the heir to the Kingdom of Judah, to the Davidic throne, who will come to take His right, is none other than Messiah! The subjection of Jerusalem, predicted by Christ and accomplished in history, was not, therefore, final. It will last only until "the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." And what will happen then? A crisis to which the crisis of 70 A.D. could be compared in kind, perhaps, but certainly not in extent nor in degree. For whereas in the lesser crisis one small people was involved, the Jews themselves, and one small land of Palestine, the greater crisis will involve mankind at large and the whole wide world. All the continuous troubles of this age summed up in one and more added! "Distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth"! Evil at the climax, at the crisis! "And then . . ." What! "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory."

But how, people ask, are we to know the signs that will show this great *dénouement* to be near? The signs are foretold and, as will in later chap-

ters be shown in detail, they are increasingly present. Chief of signs is the fact that in 1917, the year of the Balfour Declaration and the freeing of Jerusalem from the Turk, began the cessation of the down-treading of Jerusalem, began the homeward movement of the Jews to the Promised Land, began the end of the times of the Gentiles. Never has the like been seen, since the Temple was destroyed and the people were dispersed. Just as the ending of the Kingdom of Judah was spread over some years, so we should expect an interval, we know not how long nor how short, between the beginning of the end of the times of the Gentiles in 1917 and the grand event that will begin the times of Messiah. The year, the day, the hour, are known to none, but the signs are known, because we are expressly told what things will constitute the signs and we are exhorted and encouraged, "when these things *begin* to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." The scroll of the future is thus unrolled for our reading. Old familiar arguments to the contrary will be taken in their turn, but the question that here arises is why so little of these tidings of the future is heard in the churches. Yet the people are hungry

to know what is ahead of them, what is the divine plan and purpose for the time to come.

> "I am not concerned with the past: I am concerned with the future,"

declared a lord mayor of Birmingham to a gathering held in that city by ecclesiastics of rather "modern" views. "It matters not to me whether I am descended from an ape or a jellyfish" the lord mayor even went so far as to say, being vexed by their insistence on the past and their strange silence as to the future. There is quite a chance, as we have seen, that science will eventually remove every shadow of any such ancestral blot from his 'scutcheon, but to his hearers, unduly concerned with, in the hypothesis of a possibly jellied and a certainly simian ancestry, his words perhaps sounded a discordant note. Though he doubted, said the lord mayor, whether Daniel on entering the lion's den displayed greater courage than he, in expressing these views to that company, yet he must tell them that "a preacher who is more concerned with man's origin than with the possibilities of the future is no preacher of the gospel."

Modernism has the fatal defect of not being modern enough!

An avowed aim of the modernists is to attract to the churches "the younger educated men and women of the age." It is thought to achieve this by refounding Christianity upon evolutionism, without the divine intervention declared by the prophets, adapting, as they say, Christian theology to meet the scientific standpoint.

But, as one observer has acutely observed, the younger generation are not so passionately interested as are their elders, the modernists, in Darwinism which is *vieux jeu* to them, and they are inclined to view with suspicion any hypothesis which, in this day of reconstruction of scientific theory, stands virtually unchanged since the last fifty years. Not by the old Darwinian melody, even with new variations, can modern youth be charmed into empty pews. The aloofness of the younger men, a modernist laments, was bad enough, but "so long as the younger women remained, the position was not desperate." The young women, however, are the very last to be allured by a modernist gospel of Looking Backward. In the pages of a recent work on evolution there happens to be a picture of a small simian creature which has the ability to turn its head round till it faces to the rear. Why, in the matter of religion, invite our young women to follow this

example of their more or less distant relation? No! these theories about the past are not new enough to interest the youth of to-day. Youth is vaguely told that "from some fundamental stuff in the universe the electrons arose: from them came matter: from matter life emerged," and so on, through the apish, to the human of to-day. "Fundamental stuff" is a very, very old story, but what and whence *was* this fundamental stuff! And *how* happened all the subsequent "coming," "arising," "emerging"! They say, "we know not how."

Powerless to inform us even of the past, a materialist theory of automatic evolutionism which denies the direct intervention of God is cruelly useless as a gospel of the future.

Thoughtful men and women, mindful of the recent great tragedy and deeply concerned by the menacing world conditions of to-day, are thus addressed by one ecclesiastic:

> "Man, you may be reminded, emerged from a generalised ape-like stock about a million years ago. . . . We may conclude that the religious development of humanity during recent millennia has been rapid. The fact of man's spiritual progress is sometimes de-

> nied by those who proclaim that 'human nature does not change'! Their pessimism is rooted in ignorance. Such rapid change is, in a sense, artificial. Our primary instincts, inherited from our animal ancestors remain strong. . . ."

What a mournful gospel of despair! Let us implore ministers of Christ to hold out a better hope than this! The pitilessly slow evolutionary process is like a death sentence to the critically anxious world of to-day which needs swift, divine rescue by Christ Himself. What! A million years already, since man "sprang from the ape" as the same ecclesiastic has expressed it, and *still* his "animal instincts are strong"! There is plenty of time, says this ecclesiastic, for "millions of years apparently yet remain before the earth shall cease to support life." Millions of years, indeed! How many months of modern warfare will it take to answer the recently propounded question: "Will civilisation crash?" Besides, the cosmic evolutionary process which modernists think they discern working in nature, including humanity, is not necessarily making unto joy and peace and righteousness. What was the admission of Thomas Huxley, protagonist of evolu-

tionism, who long ago and more than any layman was instrumental in barking the clergy into the materialist, Darwinian fold?

The arch-evolutionist, Thomas Huxley, said this: "I know no study which is so saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history." Huxley's estimate of evolution's result in man after one million years: "man is a brute, only more intelligent than other brutes."

And here is Huxley's verdict upon evolution's outcome in civilisation: "Even the best of modern civilisation appears to me to exhibit a condition of mankind which neither embodies any worthy ideal, nor even possesses the merit of stability." Resistance to, not reliance upon, the processes of nature, supposedly evolutionary though these might be: such was the hopeless Huxley's nearest approach to hope as is shown by Professor Bury who after quoting Huxley as above, further describes the Huxleian attitude:

> "There may be some hope of a large improvement, but otherwise he would 'welcome a kindly comet to sweep the whole affair away.' And he came to the final conclusion that such an improvement could only set in

> by deliberately resisting, instead of co-operating with, the processes of nature. 'Social progress means the checking of the cosmic process at every step and the substitution for it of another which may be called the ethical process.' How in a few centuries can man hope to gain the mastery over the cosmic process which has been at work for millions of years? 'The theory of evolution encourages no millennial anticipations.'"

This is indeed materialism unmasked! So much the more needful is a divine intervention from heaven to break through the merciless evolutionary process, to arrest this which, seen through Huxley's spectacles, looks almost like a juggernaut, to recreate, to transfigure the whole world over.

"Return, we beseech thee, O God of hosts" is all that is left to say, after Huxley's dark anticipations, "look down from heaven, and behold, and visit this time." [1]

How can man ever be a match for the cosmic process! Often have we seen him of late overwhelmed by tornado, by flood, by earthquake, helpless even in the face of disease, and, worse

[1] Psalm 80:14.

still, because more humiliating, the slave and victim of his own sin.

Delays are dangerous, and the procrastination of evolution must be fatal to its human product unless God intervene with this swift transforming power. A warning that mankind may easily become extinct, before he is fully evolved, may be found in this report from a leading British scientific exponent of evolution, who writes:

> "Two or three millions of years ago, the Primate stem sent out its first tentative branches and the result was a tangle of monkeys. First the New World monkeys diverged and then those of the Old World; the main stem grew on. It next gave off the lower anthropoid apes, and then the higher, but the main stem, vaguely known, probed on. Without haste, without rest, and sometimes leading to nothing, more branches were given off—tenative men eventually Pithecanthropus the Erect in Java, and Eoanthropus from the Sussex weald. At last came *Homo,* but even among his species there was the same sifting, for several, like the Neanderthal men, who shared in the struggle, failed to enter into the prom-

> ises. . . . Very few of the experts seem to regard even Neanderthal man as ancestral to Homo Sapiens. . . . He was no ancestor of ours."

Without committing ourselves to belief in the views of the materialists, we may observe that the hypothesis gives no guarantee that *homo sapiens*, present-day humanity, will not also fall by the way, "lead to nothing," "fail to enter into the promises." If the future offers nothing better than the continuance of the evolutionary process, how can the modernists promise that mankind will not fearfully degenerate, or even perish in its struggle against the upheavals of nature and the outbreaks of inherited animal instincts!

Modernists! You ought to be the first to preach the Second Advent. Yes! Just because you are modernists you ought to proclaim "that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." For if evolution does really account for the past, the present, and the future of mankind, then His promised divine intervention in the world's affairs, his powerful, glorious coming to reign *is far more needed than it would be if evolution were not true.* Poor super-apes that we are, if

evolutionist science and theology tell truly, may the Son of God come quickly to save us from ourselves! May He intervene in the fulness of His divine wonder-working power, lest we relapse to the simian, returning thus to our source!

In the light of modernist doctrine, such a fall is all the more possible, because one of its high priests repudiates the idea of some that "while man is physiologically a descendant of the apes, his mind is due to a special divine act of creation." No, says this high priest, "such a contention cannot be upheld. . . . The human mind has been derived by evolution from the intelligence of the lower animals." Well, then, if that be true, all the more need of the redemptive intervention of Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and of the regnant work of Jesus Christ and Him returning crowned! Really, after all, this modernist theology brings folk back, whether they like it or not, to the point at which they were before they threw over the old theology.

Sin has to be faced just the same, whatever new origin or excuse may be invented, and if twentieth-century *homo sapiens* thinks to exculpate himself from sin by "blaming it on" his extinct apish ancestor, this apish ancestor would perhaps think shame on his descendants of to-day

for advancing morally so little in a million years, might even protest that some things they do he would have scorned to think of, might actually disown them as degenerate, as failing to fulfil the first promise of their ancestry. Who knows! . . .

The modern mind, one writer says, has "a silent dislike of the word sin," and adds the comfortable assurance that "there are sins in abundance, but there is no sin." Less subtle minds might esteem this a distinction without much difference, and might wonder how the abundant sins can be, except as the fruit of sin, the tree. But in opposition to this view a modernist bishop, while also denying that sin originated with the Fall, insists that sin does exist all the same, saying:

> "The delusion is widespread that if there can be no fall there was no sin. One would have thought that the fact of sin was such a matter of constant experience that it could not be disputed."

And he says, too,

> "I should have thought that after five years of war, followed by a terrible increase of

> brutality and lust, no one could have doubted the existence of sin."

So, whatever its origin, sin exists, and after and in spite of one million years of human evolution it still persists. The cure of sin matters even more than the cause of sin. If evolution explains the cause of sin, it assuredly does not provide its cure. For what is the use of a remedy which operates so slowly that the patient, before he is cured, is dead! Civilisation's chronic disease of sin has become acute. The world cannot wait for evolution! Sin is stronger and swifter-footed than evolution, and sin is winning the race! Cancer of the soul, sin defies, much more than does cancer of the body, the curative hopes and devices of man. What help then is there: what cure! Only Divine intervention is the cure.

> "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith: Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." [1]

The ravages of sin in this world will end only with the return and reign of Jesus, the Lamb of God—"for he is Lord of lords and King of kings." [2]

[1] St. John 1:29.
[2] Revelation 17:14.

The modern mind, do you say, does not accept this view! What of that! The modern mind cannot make the truth in its own image. Theologians labouring to adapt their preaching of the Lord Jesus Christ to suit modern ideas might usefully remember and reflect upon this simple fact—that the modern mind is no novelty! Each successive generation thinks it has one. At each moment of history, human knowledge has seemed remarkable to its possessors, who have considered themselves the last word in modernity, just as folk are apt to think themselves in these days. The modern mind was in full blast nineteen centuries ago, in Athens, as the Apostle found, when they brought him unto Areopagus, "for all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing."[1] And when they heard the apostolic preaching, "some mocked"[2] as some "modern minds" have mocked every day since then; as some mocked in the nineteenth century when, flushed with a little dangerous knowledge, they had small doubt that they were the people, and wisdom, if it would not die with, was at least born with, them! And to-day, after all these centuries, the so-called "modern mind" is with

[1] Acts 17:21. [2] Acts 17:32.

us still! The problem of how to deal with the "modern mind" faced the apostles just as much as it faces any Christian bishop to-day. Christians were then, as they are now, urged to preach another gospel, one in keeping with the various contemporary ideas and values, some gospel more acceptable to the men of their day. To all such appeals, from whatever quarter, the apostolic reply—as proper to be made now as when first uttered—was this:

> "Do I seek to please men? For if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."[1]

Superb response!

> "Am I now seeking the favour of men or of God? or am I trying to please men? If I were still pleasing men I should not be a servant of Christ."[2]

Human nature! Such is the right and real name for the "modern mind." Human nature sophisticated—that, neither more or less, is the modern mind. Human nature, the same in the twentieth century as it was in the first century, at all times thinking itself modern. Is it that modernist

[1] Galatians 1:10.
[2] Galatians 1:10 (Revised Version).

clergy and ministers are too cloistered to know human nature as it is? Have they not discovered the *essential reason why* the "modern mind" all through the Christian era has been clamouring for another gospel, reshaped to suit its taste?

Human nature is jealous of Jesus—that is the reason why! Jealousy being human nature's besetting sin, obviously it is of Jesus that human nature is supremely jealous. Human nature is envious of His heavenly origin; envious of His perfect sinlessness, envious of His royalty and His throne; envious, about all, of His deity. Hence the perpetual attacks, made during nineteen centuries, upon these, His attributes and prerogatives. When he comes again, in His divine power and glory, the world at last will come and worship before him and glorify His name. His ambassadors, clergy and ministers, have only to hold firm till then, saying: "as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts."[1] A great and loyal support is awaiting them in these critical times from those who will rejoice to hear them thus refusing to compromise with the demand of the age-old "modern mind" for a "transformed Christianity" which shall re-

[1] I Thessalonians II, 4.

duce Jesus to the merely and solely human and divest Him of His deity.

The cloven hoof of Darwinism, when from a scientific working-hypothesis, it is changed into a dogma and opposed to revelation, consists in this: It presents the Lord Jesus Christ as the product of evolution—differing from ordinary human beings not in kind but only in degree. It presents Him as a mere descendant of the supposed ancestral ape. When they see Him coming again in His glory as God, the words will die on their lips! Meanwhile, such is human pride, that it would tear down and destroy the only hope for the world—the deity of Jesus. For if He were but an evolved superman, He would be powerless to save His fellowmen, powerless to vanquish the sin which is inherent in the human race, powerless to replace the evils now rampant on earth, by the Kingdom of God.

This planet is studded here and there with the ruins of divers civilisations, whose fall was the wages of corruption from within and war from without. Nowadays, as the planet shrinks in size, by reason of new means of intercommunication, the system of civilisation tends to become so worldwide that if it goes the way of the civilisations of the past, how great will be the fall

thereof! And is it now, when the world is rushing to the climax of its history, that the Christian Church is asked to preach a Jesus merely human, or even superhuman, but a Jesus who is not also God! If Jesus be not God, then are we twentieth-century men and women, of all mankind, in any time, most miserable. The illusion of inevitable progress that drugged the preceding generation into contented optimism has departed, and we see humanity powerless before evils that only a divine champion, the divine Redeemer and King, can destroy "with the brightness of his coming." To lose the deity of Jesus and find but the human left would mean blackness of darkness indeed. His Church is asked to deny His deity, for the sake of winning the ear and favour of the world. He himself was asked, but refused to deny His deity! Challenged, his testimony of himself was: "I am the Christ the Son of the Blessed, the Son of God." [1] To foe and friend he announced his own coming again in divine might and divine glory, in his second coming to be and to establish the Kingdom of God.[2] A strange and dreadful thing if his own Church were now, after Calvary, and at the end of nineteen centuries, and, what

[1] St. Matthew 26:63, 64; St. Mark 14:61, 62.
[2] St. Luke 21:27, 28, 31.

is more, in the presence of such signs as he has said will herald his return, to cease to preach and worship him as very God of very God! . . .

How to win the young generation is more than ever a problem for the churches, who are urged by some that this necessitates preaching on "modern" lines. It must not, however, be imagined that the youth of to-day and to-morrow will believe in the claims and the significance of a merely human Jesus, however noble, who lived and died so very long ago. The new generation is more or less oblivious of all that happened before the great war, let alone what happened nearly two thousand years ago. Such a mental and spiritual break with the past was never known. Modernism is no modernism which does not take account of that fact. Lifeless and conventional will the younger generation consider a religion founded on the memory of a dead man. They will not permanently, if at all, accept as their guide a Jesus, only human, of nineteen hundred years ago, who is depicted for them by imaginative preachers who take part of the Gospel account and leave the rest, even if they are assured that in some mysterious way, vaguely and variously defined, he is a still enduring influence. Youth is asking what could he know, a simple Galilean

peasant who died long since in Palestine—what could he know of the problems of this twentieth-century world! How can he, a voice from the ancient past, avail in this present day, and in the unknown and perhaps dangerous future! Borne along on the stream of time and events, young men and women, if they cast a backward glance, see Jesus, yes, even Him crucified, motionless there, a shadowy figure diminishing and receding further and further into the haze and distance of the past. But their gaze does not linger—their head turns, to find whither they are going, face forward, eyes looking for the future. Jesus is there, ahead of them, did they but know it. Time is carrying them, not only historically *away* from Him, but also historically *towards* Him. Between the past historic event of His first advent and the future historic event of His second advent, lies the time-track along which the present generation, like many preceding ones, is travelling. The signs indicate that this journey's end is near; that this generation will reach it; that just as the disciples saw with their eyes Jesus, God manifest in flesh, in the days of his self-imposed weakness and humility, so the people of to-day will see Him in His second coming, equally manifest, but this time in the fulness of His glory and His power. This

Jesus, the same to-morrow as yesterday, is He whom youth can best understand, because He is a living God and a God of and for the living. Let the churches try the experiment of preaching this gospel of His coming and His kingdom, before they say that the young people will not understand!

The young, we are told, are in revolt against authority and only experience will content them as a basis for religion. Experience in plenty they can get from the signs of the times which are now supplying a basis for the belief that their Redeemer draweth nigh and that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand. These signs provide the experience, the touchstone whereby they may test and prove the truth of the Biblical revelation of Him, whose actual coming again will make their experience complete. More convincing by far is this outer experience, provided by the signs of the times, which all who look may have in common, than is the personal, inner experience which some folk recommend but do not intelligibly define. It has its dangers, the present-day insistence upon inner "experience," as opposed to Biblical authority, the so-called "shifting of the centre of gravity in religion from authority to experience." A tendency to psychism, to

occultism, might not impossibly develop. Shall we see modernism "evolving" in that direction! A humanist religion will never long suffice or survive. The superhuman element in some form will find its entrance.

Young people, when counselled by grave and reverend seniors to make inner experience, instead of authority, the basis of their religious belief, will ask: "*What* do *you* experience, and *how* do you experience it?" For, in this scientific age, the demand is for precision of statement. Again, the enquiring mind of youth will naturally go on to ask: "Will *my* experience be the same as *yours,* and if not, which of these differing experiences is valid—which provides the true basis of belief? Or will your experience and my experience, even if conflicting, both be equally valid?" What will be the end of it all! So many men, so many experiences—so many men, so many religions! A babel of religions! One of the younger writers[1] actually deals with this point and declares the unreliability of inner experience as a foundation for religion. He exalts, by contrast, the way of the scientist, saying, "the safeguard of the objectivity of science is sense perception." What a man of science perceives is, as this writer

[1] Aldous Huxley in *A Note on Dogma.*

urges, for all practical purposes the *same,* not only for himself at different periods, but for all other observers, whereas the intuitions upon which some would build religion may be, even for the same person, different at different moments, and "the intuitions of all men are by no means identical." All men, he pursues, "have similar sensations, but not all have similar intuitions," the two contrasted philosophies of transcendence and pantheism being based on two different intuitions, and he asks:

> "Which of these two dogmas is true? . . . Our existing scientific theories mean roughly the same to all human beings. . . . Anyone who has normal sense organs and knows the rules of the logical game, can test. . . the relative temporary human truth of any scientific theory . . ."

But with theological dogmas based upon inner experience, upon intuition, "it is different." Very true, but this writer who, by the way, considers that "we are living to-day in what is probably the most irreligious epoch in all history" seems not yet to have sought the scientific proof of Christianity in Biblical prophecy as verified by past history and by present conditions and events. Human sense perceptions are thus made the

"safeguard of the objectivity" of Christianity. The public fulfilment, through centuries and at this very day, of publicly recorded prophecy is evidence of a strictly scientific kind and is evidence far more obvious and direct than that on which the scientist is able to rely.

Not authority alone, not experience alone, but authority and erperience together form the basis of Christianity—authority revealing, experience proving. What hypothesis is to the sciences, revelation is to Christianity. Sciences and Christianity alike summon the sense perceptions of humanity as witnesses to their truth. The only difference is that whereas science employs hypothesis, Christianity enjoys revelation, so that the teaching of science about nature is only relative, whereas the teaching of Christianity about the Lord Jesus Christ is absolute.

Marvellous will be the confluence of authority and experience when He comes again. "Except I shall *see,* I will not believe!" This was the demand for experience: upon experience followed the recognition of authority, "and Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God."

For the modern world, then, a great experience is in store. For "Behold, he cometh with

clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him." And they also which doubted concerning Him! And when they shall see, in His scarred hands and feet and in all the power and glory of His coming, the full and final evidence that "Jesus Christ is the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead, the ruler of the kings of the earth, he that loveth us and loosed us from our sins, by his blood . . . the Alpha and the Omega, the Lord God who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty." [1]

[1] Revelation 1:5, 8.

CHAPTER VI

Christianity and Science

THE beauty of it is that while science is being invited to sit in judgment upon Christianity, and men of science are urged to "set forth their religious ideals and to show how, in their minds, Christianity and science interact"—savants are emphasising the fact that modern science actually springs from, is actually the daughter of, Christianity! Hear Dr. Höffding[1] tell how, as far back as the Middle Ages, Christianity laid the foundation of modern science!

> "The thought of the Middle Ages was theological. The theology of a monotheistic religion is based on the fundamental thought that there is one single cause of all things. Apart from the grave difficulties which this thought involves, it has the important and valuable effect of accustoming men to abstract from differences and details, and of preparing them for the acceptance of an

[1] *A History of Modern Philosophy,* Dr. Harold Höffding, Professor in the University of Copenhagen.

interconnection of all things according to law. The Middle Ages educated men to this thought, to which the natural man, overpowered by the manifoldness of phenomena and inclined to polytheism, does not feel himself drawn."

We may yet—and soon—see science return to Christianity for a further store of wisdom, for another great idea! The origin of modern science in Christianity is shown also by Professor A. N. Whitehead in his *Science and the Modern World*. He says:

"How has this conviction arisen that every detailed occurrence can be correlated with its antecedents in a perfectly rational manner exemplifying general principles? Without this belief the inevitable labours of scientists would be without hope. . . . There seems but one source for its origin. It must come from the mediaeval insistence on the *rationality of God*. . . . Every detail was supervised and ordered, the search into nature could only result in the vindication of the faith in rationality. What I mean is the impress on the European mind arising from

> the unquestioned faith of centuries . . . the instinctive tone of thought.
>
> In Asia the conceptions of God were of a being who was either too arbitrary or too impersonal for such ideas to have much effect on instinctive habits of mind. . . . There was not the same confidence as in the intelligible rationality of a personal being. The faith in the possibility of science, generated antecedently to the development of modern scientific theory is an unconscious derivative from mediaeval theology."

More great lessons has science still to learn from Christianity. It has to learn from Christianity what is the source of universal energy. Some have thought it might be the "annihilation of matter"—but how, then, did the annihilated matter itself come into existence! "Creation in being," is a recent cry—"Creation Still Going On!" Of course it is; we read that from a very early Christian. But to scientists this is, "an entirely new conception of the universe," based upon the recent discovery of evidence which they think may prove that "the process of creation is now going on" and that there is in the universe a continual production of elements. In other

words, the energy which, as science rather tardily discovered, constitutes matter, is now suspected by scientists to proceed from a source which is inexhaustible. What that source may be they do not know and cannot conceive. But the Bible knows and shows this source: it anticipates modern scientific ideas about matter and beckons science to advance a still further step by these words: "The worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," [1] or, to render the latter part of the sentence in plain modern English "the visible was made out of the invisible." [2] Already the Old Testament had pointed to the power, the energy of God as being expressed in material creation—"He hath made the earth by His power"—but the New Testament shows this even more clearly.

Notice, here, the admitted and urgent need of modern science for a new guiding principle. "Physical science is in the throes of the greatest generalisation since Newton's *Principia*," says Dr. Fournier d'Albe. But science won't find a generalisation great enough unless she asks it of Christianity, out of which, as admitted, modern science originally sprang. Professor Whitehead,

[1] Hebrews 11:3. [2] Moffatt's Translation.

having testified to Christianity as the origin of modern science, has this to say of the position and need of science to-day:

> "The progress of science has now reached a turning point. If science is not to develop into a medley of *ad hoc* hypotheses, it must become philosophical, and must enter upon a thorough criticism of its own foundations." [1]

Philosophy and science are both in the melting pot, and Professor Whitehead further says:

> "I think that no one can study the evidence without becoming convinced that we are in the presence of one of the most profound reorganisations of modern thought."

But the great new generalisation is wanting! That is the trouble. Or rather it is there, but philosophers and scientists are apt to seek it in every direction but the right one.

They will find in this Biblical setting the jewel of their quest:

> "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers

[1] *Science and the Modern World.*

by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and *upholding all things by the word of his power,* when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. . . ."[1]

Yes! Creation is still going on, for Jesus, the Son of God, is continuously upholding all things, He "sustains the universe."[2] He is the fountain head of that matter-creating energy whose source scientists wonder how to find. The universe, all things, all existence[3] came into being through Him, and by His word of power He is sustaining the universe now. Creation is still in being and the creative energy proceeds from the very Godhead. God the Son, by the word of His power upholding all things: that pulsing, divine energy, as it were a great heart beating, sustaining the universe, maintaining all existence! Such is the generalisation which must illuminate the path of

[1] Hebrews 1:1-3.
[2] Hebrews 1:3 (Moffatt's Translation).
[3] St. John 1:3 (Moffatt's Translation).

science, the dominant truth which philosophy cannot defy without destroying itself. Behind creation is the personal God, its creator: behind the laws of nature, so imperfectly known to us still, is the personal God whose laws they are. That in Jesus should inhere creation, by the word of His power; redemption, by the blood of His cross; and rule, by His regnant authority, is a great wonder. But then, only familiarity blinds us to the wonder of everything that is, the wonder that we as human beings exist, that we think and act and fill, each of us, a multiple rôle; that one man, for instance, can be, in his own person, king of England, defender of the faith, emperor of far-spreading lands, and husband, father, landlord, neighbour; or that another can be all at once Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, Minister of War, of the Navy, of the Air, of the Interior, of Corporations, of everything, without counting all the personal relations of his life. One man in his time, and often at one and the same time, plays many parts, bears many responsibilities, performs many functions. If so much is possible with man, how much more is possible with God! It all throws at least an explanatory sidelight upon that history of how, with redemptive purpose, and expressly *for* that purpose,

> "Christ Jesus, . . . being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. . . ." [1]

Things have come to this strange pass—that while some of the theologians are proclaiming: "We accept all the assured conclusions of modern science and are ready so far as is necessary to apply them to modify the traditional doctrines of the Christian Church," scientists are heard saying: "But we haven't got any assured conclusions now." Time, space, matter, material, ether, electricity, magnetism, organism, configuration, structure, pattern, function, all require reinterpretation: Theory succeeds theory so rapidly that, apologising to the British Association for not having his paper printed, one scientist said that "anything printed is *ipso facto* out of date." Professor Whitehead[2] illustrates this modern lack of assured scientific conclusions by asking:

[1] Philippians 2:6-8.
[2] *Science and the Modern World.*

> "What is the use of talking about a mechanical explanation, when you do not know what you mean by mechanics!"

Therefore it is plain that a new Christianity cannot come from the scientists; rather must a renewed science come from Christianity. We are all theologians now, however, and scientists, or some of them, may be heard, like other folk, expressing opinions on religion. Noticeable is it that scientists to-day do not assume the aggressive attitude of a Thomas Huxley. The advance of knowledge since Huxley's day has slain the old-fashioned scientific dogmatism of last century. Scientists now are more impressed by what they do not know than by what they do know. This advance in true wisdom is also a return to the great Newton who accounted himself, in relation to universal truth, as a mere schoolboy standing on the brink of the mighty ocean. A British prime minister, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, lauding the Newtonian modesty of the scientists of to-day, offered this example thereof, culled from the works of his friend Professor Eddington:

> "I should have liked to close these lectures by leading up to some great climax; but per-

haps it is more in accordance with the true conditions of scientific progress that they should fizzle out with a glimpse of the obscurity which marks the frontiers of present knowledge. But I do not apologise for the lameness of the conclusion for it is not a conclusion. I wish I could feel confident that it is even a beginning."

Nevertheless Huxley,—for all his scepticism born of the very limited science of his time, a science so dangerously limited that it ensnared men in the illusion of knowing far more than they did,—nevertheless Huxley, in spite of this very illusion to which so many gifted men of his time fell victim, said some sage things, that may even to-day be recommended to the consideration of those now living, who are tempted to hark back to the defunct, sceptical fallacies of the 1860's. "It is the secret of the superiority of the best theological teachers to their opponents," said Huxley, "that they recognise the realities of things." And he declared the doctrine of original sin, the power of Satan in this world, of "a malevolent Demiurge subordinate to a beneficial Almighty"—though he did not accept them—to be nevertheless,

> "Vastly nearer the truth than the 'liberal' popular illusion that babies are all born good and that the example of a corrupt society is responsible for their failure to remain so; that it is given to everybody to reach the ethical ideal if he will only try; that all partial evil is universal good and other optimistic figments."

As to whether we can all fulfil the moral law, he replied, "I should say hardly any of us." One is left wondering whether, had he lived in these days, his sceptical, negative materialism would not have been dissolved and his mental and spiritual horizon would not have been enlarged, in correspondence with the vast new prospect opened up by the science of the twentieth century: whether the tragic events and possibilities that mark this first third of the new century, would not have made an end of his confidence in the self-sufficiency of humankind. Howbeit, we dwellers in the twentieth-century world cannot shelter behind this nineteenth-century thinker who had necessarily so much less knowledge. Why! even the commonplaces of flight and wireless communication were outside his ken and beyond his imagination, and of relativity, radioactivity,

the quantum theory, and other such modern scientific matters he had never heard. The negative and destructive ideas of the last century, with the insistence upon mere humanism, cannot guide us who have the enlarged experience of the world available to those who have lived through the past fifteen years or so.

Yet strange to say, some scientists of to-day, when they discuss religion, are apt to ignore modern scientific ideas and retreat to the standpoint of some of their last-century predecessors. They may even indulge in certain old-fashioned fleers at the Bible with its "geocentric" notions, its "conception of a fixed, flat earth round which the sun revolves, an earth considered as the centre of the universe." Let justice be done, even to the Bible! Long before science knew it, the Bible revealed the sphericity of the earth. Thus the prophet Isaiah, according even to a very modern translation, told of "the *round* earth."[1] Job plainly and popularly stated a scientific fact, long before astronomy knew it: "He hangeth the earth upon nothing." Now for this geocentric business! To begin with, if the Bible speaks geocentrically, so does twentieth-century humanity—so even do the astronomers. They even measure

[1] Isaiah 40:22 (Moffatt's Translation).

time geocentrically, and the sidereal day is defined as "the time interval between two consecutive transits of the same star across the meridian" and the sidereal year as "the time occupied by the sun in completing the circuit of the heavens from a given star to the same star again." An eclipse of the sun, the most exciting of all events to an astronomer, is a geocentric phenomenon, is witnessed from the earth as the centre of observation, and is meaningless unless geocentrically considered. Astronomy is, after all, a geocentric science, no matter how far it may reach out from its centre. And if astronomy, then even more are the other sciences geocentric. How could it be otherwise with the sciences of what is even in these inventive days, a still more or less earth-bound race!

Then is the Bible alone—really the least geocentric of all books—to take no account of the geocentric point of view, and is Christian theology alone, the least geocentric of all the sciences, to take no account of geocentricity! It is affectation to suggest that the Bible and Christians are the only geocentrists. But that is not nearly all, for time brings strange and sometimes quite amusing revenges. The word has gone forth that it is as scientifically true to say that the earth does not

turn and that the earth is the centre of the solar system, and, indeed, of the whole starry universe, as it is to say the contrary. Relativity is the reason! All this is discussed by M. Charles Nordmann, astronomer at the Observatory of Paris. Arguing the relativity of space, he cites the great scientist Poincaré, saying:

> "He pushed his deductions in this domain to the length of affirming that even the rotation of the earth round the sun is only a hypothesis, more convenient than the inverse hypothesis, but not more true for, if it were more true, that would imply the existence of an absolute space." [1]

"Does the Earth Turn?" Under this chapter heading, M. Nordmann [2] himself remarks that this old problem, this old trial, that one thought judged without appeal since the days of Galileo, has arisen again, in a very astonishing manner, the whole question being reopened. It is the theory of relativity, it is the theory of Einstein, on an altogether unforeseen plane, which has revived this ancient problem—and yet even before Einstein, as M. Nordmann wishes to record, "two great precursors," von Mach and

[1] *Einstein et l'Univers.*
[2] *La Royaume des Cieux.*

Henri Poincaré, like torch-bearers of the advance guard, preceded him in this new path and had, before him, the intuition that it is not so sure as all that, that the earth turns. Henceforth, contended Poincaré, this affirmation—the earth turns—is meaningless, because "no experiment will enable us to verify it, for such an experiment could neither be made nor could it even be imagined by the most daring Jules Verne." For his part, M. Nordmann says that, according to the general theory of relativity, one can equally well consider the earth as turning in relation to the immobile starry sky, or the starry sky turning in relation to the immobile earth. These two cases are cinematically and dynamically speaking, identical. His conclusion is this: Galileo was right, but his adversaries, scientifically speaking, were not wrong. "Only, what neither Galileo nor his opponents knew, and what Einstein and his precursors have taught us, is that the rightness of the one in no way involves, as a consequence, the wrongness of the others, nor vice versa. . . ." Does the earth turn? this astronomer concludes—"Yes, if that please you; no, if it displease you!"

Impossible, nowadays, with scientific ideas fluctuating and changing as they do, to prove scientific accusations against the Bible! It is

scientific ideas themselves that are, without any exception, on trial: to the honour of scientists be that said!

The subject of the Bible is, however, not physical science, but the Lord Jesus Christ and the evidence concerning him. Strange to say, this evidence is not being studied by our present-day scientific essayists in religion as it was by the scientific giants and pioneers, Newton and Pascal. Yet if men of science have any special qualification to speak of religion, it surely is their habit of weighing evidence, and they, above all others, should be observing the sensible evidences of Christianity, afforded not only by past fulfilments of prophecy, but by the present appearance of a multiplicity of long-predicted signs of the return of the Christ of the Bible. There are scientists who are no more scientific than other folk, once they step outside their own specialised field of investigation. Doubtless this is the reason why some scientists' writings about Christianity show no characteristically scientific outlook and take no account of the concrete evidence upon which Christianity is based.

There is no need for science to invent a new religion, because, firstly, no new religion is needed, and secondly, there is not any new religion to in-

vent, every attempt thereat being inevitably a rechauffé of something old. Nothing has come of the tentative searching for new religious ideas made by the very few scientists who even dream of such a hopeless quest. One of them may dissent from orthodox beliefs by doubting the existence of a personal God, but it is years in thousands since that negative idea was first entertained. Such an one may, in his own mind, substitute for God an imagined, impersonal power and call it by any sort of name spelled with a capital letter. So did many another in very antique days. He may declare the Biblical portraiture of human nature too unflattering, but so have others as long as there has been a Bible, and there is, of course, nothing characteristically scientific about this point of view. Or perhaps (for though evolutionary materialism is losing ground in the sciences, it lingers more persistently as an idol of the forum) he will urge that human nature has time to mend, the human race being sure and certain to grow, in every way, every million years, better and better, and being still, comparatively speaking, in its infancy, a mere few-days-old babe. Ah! but has he considered how liable is infancy to mishap, how dangerous

are the diseases of infancy, how high the rate of infantile mortality! Suppose this, by hypothesis, still infant human race should succumb ere it reach maturity! Suppose this infant race fall victim to the combined influences, firstly, of the environment, supplied by an imperfect civilisation, and secondly, of an apish heredity, attended by certain deplorable instincts! The Bible not only offers a diagnosis which, whether we like it or not, does square with the symptoms, but it also offers a cure, both for human nature and for the resultant ills of civilisation.

Furthermore, if a man, whether of science or otherwise, say that he feels a sense of "spiritual relief" which comes from "rejecting the idea of God as a super-natural Being," many have felt and said the same: but the point is, were they, and is he, mistaken? He, or another, may shrink from worshipping divine glory arising from divine power, and may protest that "the presentation of God under the aspect of power awakens every modern instinct of critical reaction." Yet is this instinct wholly and exclusively modern? It slightly savours of the old Adam, after all! But modern or not, is this instinct of critical reaction defensible, if God is—as upon ripe reflection it is

obvious He must be—a God of power, that mighty and that glorious God who has said:

> "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." [1]

Unless God were powerful, how could there exist this universe which, by the witness of modern science, is nothing but the visible expression of invisible power! And if God is thus powerful in nature, what reason is there to deny that He is also powerful in the concerns of man. We cannot impose a limit upon the activities of God. A strange fashion, nowadays, is to treat religious truth as dependent upon human preference: if a doctrine is liked, it is true; if it is disliked, it is untrue—which is absurd. The power of God in human affairs does not depend upon human consent or dissent. An instinctive reaction against the idea of God as powerful is no proof whatever that He is *not* powerful. The evidence must de-

[1] Isaiah 45:21-23.

cide, and this evidence we have in the prophecy-fulfilling signs and events of to-day.

> "Who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time! have not I the Lord? . . . I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it." [1]

Thus the conclusive evidence of God and of His power is supplied by His predictions and their fulfilment in history. "Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he." [2] In the New Testament we find, as in the Old, the same God, pointing us to the same evidence of His being and His power.

A God who is love, not power, is they say, the God they want, but they cannot have His love without His power: Jesus is both. Love and power in Him are joined. Since God is love, it is surely well that He is also power. . . .

The present chaos of religious beliefs and unbeliefs urgently requires reduction to order. But how is that possible? How decide what is true, when even doctors of divinity, in these latter days, increasingly disagree and their discord is increased

[1] Isaiah 45:21. Isaiah 46:11.
[2] St. John 13:19.

by the many and conflicting religious notions of the laity! Fact must decide. The decisive religious fact before the world to-day is that the prophecies of Christ are now coming true.

Christianity is pre-eminently a religion for the scientists, provided, of course, they do not drop scientific method when they are considering religion. "Scientific method," says one of them, "is the only method which will give satisfactory foundation for beliefs: it consists in demanding facts as the only basis of conclusions." Christianity complies with this demand: it gives facts as the foundation of belief. Science cannot ignore phenomena. The present abnormal signs of the times are phenomena which already deserve and soon will compel the attention of scientific minds. It will then be found that the facts are inexplicable upon any alternative hypothesis and can only mean, as He who predicted them declared they would mean, that His coming, which is to say the Kingdom of God, is nigh at hand. . . . The real service which science can render to religion is upon that line.

"The spirit of adventure," we were recently assured by a student of natural science, is strong in him and his kind, who do not allow themselves to be deterred from a theory merely because it

appears incompatible with all that has gone before and to such theories they are indeed "attracted." Very well, then, the scientists have nothing to plead against studying the second advent as announced by the signs of the times! Away with the ridiculous idea that science can "dispense with the hypothesis of God," can neglect Christianity! Let scientists recall that Christianity, by impressing on the mind of Europe "the notion of the detailed providence of a rational, personal God," generated the scientists' trust in the order of nature. Nor can scientists continue to assume that this order of nature will not change at the command of Him who first established it. "The assumption that no modification of the physical laws of nature is to be looked for in environments which have any striking difference from the environments for which the laws have been observed to hold, is very unsafe," says a modern savant, and his warning has wider application than he perhaps thinks. God, who created nature's order and laws, can and will intervene to modify its order: Behold, I will do a new thing![1]

Science needs to drink again of the fount that

[1] Isaiah 43:19.

gave her life. A modern American[1] has admirably declared that need, showing how, upon the basis of Christianity, Thomas Aquinas built up "a great system of genuine science," which "seeks understanding rather than description, contemplation rather than control." Exalting this system, he says: "Its goal was wisdom, a comprehension of the meaning and significance of things, above all of the chief end of man, the meaning of human life and all creation as related to it and hence its object was that which alone gave purpose to existence, God."

In contrast to this, says this American thinker, our modern science tells us how to do an infinitely greater number of things, it picks apart the cogwheels of nature, "but it is not wise . . . and before the greatest problem of all, what meaning can man give to his life, it gives a despairing *nescio,* if not an I don't care." And his summing up is that the ambition toward wisdom and toward God, of the science of that former day was "a worthy ambition to which men must return."

Our modern scientists, moved by the high ambition of their long-ago Christian fathers in science, but with the greater advantage of actually

[1] *The Making of the Modern Mind,"* John Herman Randal, Jn: Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University.

witnessing the signs and portents visible in these latter times, may, if they will, enjoy the privilege of watching, and interpreting in accordance with prophecy, the writing of the finger of God as it is traced in the present happenings in nature and in human affairs. . . .

Turning now to the world of letters, we find literary men more and more concerning themselves with religion and "my religion" becoming a favourite theme. There is a veritable reign of relativity here, in the sense that many writers treat the truth of religious ideas as being dependent upon their own personal point of view. Thus every man is apt to be a sort of Moses unto himself. But even men of letters, for all that they are the most inventive and imaginative of our race, have not been able to make any new revelation—proving once more that no new religious idea, true or false, is possible, because all have been thought of long ago. The religion of humanity, now fashionable among some writers, is not as new as crinolines would be if they returned to fashion. Even if the religion of humanity find its logical outcome in the worship of a superman, this will be only a throw-back to Caesar worship in Ancient Rome. To question the personality of God is a very old story. Even

to "refuse worship to a personal deity," as it has been expressed, and to deny the deity, even while admiring the humanity, of Christ merely awakes the reminiscent echo:

> "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." [1]

Among old religious doctrines, that the moderns are departing from, is the doctrine of the Atonement. But can even this departure be called a new one, for already in his far-off days, the Apostle had discovered how great in some eyes was "the offence of the cross"! The whole point and reason of criticising the old doctrines should surely be to replace them by new and better ones. But there's the difficulty! Evolution had been mooted as the alternative to Atonement, but, besides being anything but new, it apparently will not do. Sixty or seventy years ago it was hailed as a possible cure, but even Thomas Huxley himself cannot really have hoped anything much of a non-redemptive cure for sin, or would he have written as he did:

> "If some great Power would agree to make me always think what is right and do what is right, on condition of being turned into

[1] Psalms 2:3.

> a sort of clock and wound up every morning before I got out of bed, I should instantly close with the offer. The only freedom I care about is the freedom to do right, and the freedom to do wrong I am ready to part with on the cheapest terms to anyone who will take it of me." [1]

A great Power, apart from and higher, stronger than man, who should offer emancipation from the sin in human nature—such, then, was Huxley's ideal after all, but however good, it was not original. Some thirteen centuries before Huxley, the prophet was announcing a day when God would make this new covenant: "After these days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts." A few centuries after that, came Christ saying, as he went forth to die, "This is my blood of the new covenant," thus claiming that the ancient divine offer of righteousness was a testament made operative by His death, a contract whose consideration is the sacrificial gift of himself, a treaty sealed by His blood. In other words, "a great Power offered" to make mankind think, do, and be what is right.

[1] *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley.*

Emmanuel Library
Emmanuel School of Religion
Route 6
Johnson City, Te

But who can wonder that the young men and women, who first knew this world when it was at war and are now in danger of another war, of which they will bear the brunt, are critical of Christianity as they often hear it preached. If all that is true, say they, why is the world not better, why are even Christians not better? The only true answer to this most natural enquiry is that Christ will return to consummate, in individuals and in the world, his pacifying and purifying work begun on Calvary. To the younger generation, the return of Christ must be preached, and prophecy, with its fulfilment in past and present, must be invoked as the prime evidence of Christianity. Otherwise they may, and some do, imagine that an emotional experience, of what sort they know not, is requisite to faith. One novelist of the younger school, his "soul troubled by events that the most hardened sceptic cannot ignore," has challenged a bishop to help him to "*feel* that Christ was divine," as he cannot foresee the solution of the problem "except in emotional terms." The shifting sand of emotion will never do to found belief. Facts first, feeling after, is the rule in Christianity, as in science. A Rutherford, a Millikan arrive at their scientific discoveries by way of facts, whatever may be

their subsequent feelings of exaltation at the wonders discovered. So it must be with religion —facts before feelings—because feelings, alone, may lead astray into erroneous belief and even false allegiance. Christianity, the great objective and factual religion, does not condemn or compel enquirers to rely upon emotion, intuition, or any merely subjective experience. At his first advent, the Founder of Christianity himself gave objective proofs and credentials; that is to say, his words and deeds, at that time, matched the Scriptural predictions concerning him, which had for centuries been of public record. Furthermore, he himself uttered prophecies destined to objective fulfilment in their turn.

This same appeal to evidence, and not to emotion, was the keynote of the apostolic preaching, which persistently set forth Jesus as fulfilling in his person and in his career the ancient predictions contained in the law, the psalms, and the prophets. The deadly mistake of the churches has been to depart so far from this sane and hallowed example. Under pressure from the world, the churches have almost let go the argument of prophecy and its fulfilment, this strongest weapon in their armoury. Yet its persistent use

would have prevented much muddled thinking as to what Christianity really is. . . .

Among the religious searchings of the *intelligenzia* there crops up again the fallacy of an automatic of evolution as opposed by so many to divine intervention, for some of them seem to shrink from the thought of a personal dealing by God in the affairs of the beings He has created and to prefer to depend on the working of impersonal natural forces than of a personal God who says "I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth, for in these things I delight." [1] But here a voice from one of the universities is heard saying that among the youth there congregated, the vogue of Darwinism is ended, in favour of such "Freudian arguments as that religion is but the organisation, in a form tolerable to a mature mind of the inferences which a child draws as to the power and authority of its parents." How difficult to be truly modern! We English-speaking peoples, though in advance in many matters, are in some fields of thought apt to lag behind. While English and perhaps even American youth may be discussing, for instance, the ideas of

[1] Jeremiah ix:24.

Freud, he is on the continent of Europe already outdated and outmoded by a decade. Writing of what he calls "the famous—too famous doctrine of Sigmund Freud," Dr. Maurice de Fleury of the French Académie de Médicine, says that Freud and his disciples have formed "a philosophic and medical conception which is the most profoundly hollow, and in my opinion the emptiest of truth, that has ever come out of the brain of a thinker." He would not wish to offend those who "venerate Freud as a demi-god" but this idea that all mental weaknesses have no other cause than the suppression of the demands of the *libido*—this idea and the others which constitute the Freudian doctrine," says Dr. de Fleury: "I can only consider as monstrous." This expert continues: "These ideas are repugnant to almost all minds in our country. They are revolting to us, less even by their indecency, which is absurdly systematic, than by their vanity and by their falseness, which seem to me total." Moreover, the same critic affirms that "Freud's conception and classification of mental disturbances is amazingly behind the present state of psychiatric science. . . . We know with a firm knowledge from daily experience that these mental maladies and, to begin with, the anxiety psycho-neurosis, cannot

possibly be attributed to any repression. . . . We know also that the famous unconscious does not, the least in the world, play that enormous part in their genesis which is attributed to it by the man of 'psycho-analysis.'" Modern minds must at any rate look further than Freud for light on the religious problem!

Among intellectuals in pursuit of a religion, what are called the words of Jesus, "the kingdom of God is within you" seem to find favour. They have even been interpreted to mean, "God is no external power," a most illogical conclusion, for "the kingdom of God within you" would not imply that the Kingdom of God is limited to that narrow sphere and does not also exist outside you. But as it happens, the often-quoted words are a mistranslation and what Jesus really said was "the kingdom of God is *in your midst.*" He himself is the Kingdom of God and, as such, He was actually in the midst of those who were asking Him *when* the Kingdom of God would come. Moffatt's very modern translation shows this plainly, as follows:

> "On being asked by the Pharisees when the Reign of God was coming, he answered them, 'The Reign of God is not coming as

you hope to catch sight of it; no one will say "Here it is," or "there it is," for the Reign of God is now in your midst.'" [1]

The Pharisees had been looking for the promised powerful, glorious coming of the King and the Kingdom of God, the Messiah: they had overlooked that, according to the words of prophecy, Messiah was first to suffer, before he should gloriously reign. Messiah, the very kingdom of God, was even then standing visibly and bodily in the midst of the Pharisees, just as he tells them in this passage. But, as the prophet Isaiah had forewarned them, He had to them, when they saw him in that humble guise, "no beauty that we should desire him." [2]

Standing there in the midst of them, Jesus turned from the Pharisees to his disciples and told how "he must first endure great suffering and be rejected by the present generation," but that he will come again, a second time, visibly, gloriously to reign as the Kingdom of God, "for like the lightning that flashes from one side of the sky to the other, so will the Son of man be on his own day." [3]

[1] St. Luke 17:20, 21 (Moffatt's Translation).
[2] Isaiah 53:2.
[3] St. Luke 17:24 (Moffatt's Translation).

CHAPTER VII

The Only Way

CAN anyone suggest a better way? Has the mind of man conceived a better cure for the world? Utopias in plenty have been invented, but they are all far less desirable than the return of Christ to reign—and so much more impossible and incredible!

Who can invent a truer prophecy than we find in the Bible? Certainly none truer has been uttered so far. Yet man tries to be a prophesying animal; disdain, as he may, the prophecies in the Bible, he is much, though unsuccessfully, given to prophecy himself. The favourite human idea of progress, as Professor Bury points out, is simply "a prophecy of the future," even if, as many begin to think, it is a false prophecy. Thinking man has always "pertinaciously tried to predict the future," affirms Professor F. C. S. Schiller. All the sciences have pursued the prophetic aim, for, says he, they are all modes of divination, and are esteemed and deemed true in proportion as their predictions come true.

How perfectly sound, then, the Bible is as a work of science, seeing that its predictions come true in history, which is the very field wherein human prophecy admittedly fails. "The astronomer can predict the beginning of an eclipse to a second, but in history there are no assured predictions," says one modern writer. Another, Dr. Gustave Le Bon, exclaims: "There is no eye penetrating enough to read the pages of future history." No human eye, certainly! And yet, like caged birds, men beat their breasts against the bars of this ignorance and make their wild guesses at the mysterious future.

For it is not simply curiosity, but a "practical desire for guidance which inspires our interest in the future," as says Professor Schiller, because we desire to know the future, not only for its own sake but "to prepare for what is coming." In his view, therefore, the practice of prophecy is natural, and the only question is whether it can be successful. Men have often prophesied Utopia—though women, it has been flatteringly said, never—but their prophecy they can't fulfil, for Utopia is, and will be, nowhere.

It is at once humorous and melancholy to think of such fantasies as Plato's *Republic,* More's *Utopia,* Bellamy's *Looking Backward,* Morris's

News from Nowhere: and measure them against the facts of human nature and the realities of this Age. Even our new century of great discoveries has brought no new idea for human government, only the renewed application of ideas already old, and true is the saying that humanity has produced brains capable of weighing the stars and taming the lightning for human service, but very few able to guide the destiny of nations.

Outside the pages of the Bible, we find no cure for the world's malady, and no clear view of the future—in spite of much present-day theorising "about it and about." Utopianism is, of course, on the decline. The old faith in progress sure and certain is dead or dying.

"It is probable that many people, to whom six years ago, the notion of a sudden decline and break-up of our civilisation, as a result not of cosmic forces but of its own developments would have appeared almost fantastic, will feel much less confident to-day," says Professor Bury.[1] "The faith of forty or fifty years ago in evolutionary progress has not maintained itself," says another, and the World War, "this titanic upheaval, has bewildered men and shaken their confidence in the future. If the marvellous re-

[1] *The Idea of Progress.*

sources of science are to be used to enhance the means of destruction what is likely to be the future of civilisation? In these days of widespread misery and disillusionment the old belief in progress has grown dim." The old-fashioned Darwinian panacea is going out of favour, for, we may invite Professor Bury to chime in at this point, "evolution itself does not necessarily mean, applied to society the movement of man to a desirable goal." It is a "neutral scientific conception," and upon evolution a "theory of pessimism may be built up as speciously as a theory of optimism."

Pessimism is, indeed, the note of human prophesying to-day, though some writers are putting up a mild and not very effectual defence against the sombre conclusion of Oswald Spengler that civilisations are subject to the law of decline and death. Among modern writers, Spengler was not first in the field with this theory. Sir Flinders Petrie, the great archaeological student of the dead civilisations, published before the war his *Revolutions of Civilisation*. Can we, he asks, learn from our survey of the history of human nature any general principles that may be "projected on the mists of the future"? Our knowledge of the past makes it evident to him that "civilisation is

an intermittent and recurrent phenomenon" and each civilisation has its "growth and fall," and is marked off "by an age of barbarism or decline before and after it." In every past civilisation, a sign and symptom of decline has been, Professor Petrie finds, the degraduation of art, which after having risen to mastery becomes archaic with the decline of a civilisation. Is there a warning here for the civilisation of our own day?

Each civilisation begins with strong personal rule, the next stage is an oligarchy when leadership is still essential, but the unity of the country can be maintained by law instead of by autocracy. Then gradually the transformation to a democracy takes place. During this time wealth continues to increase and, the easier life is rendered thereby, the more easy is decay and degradation. Such are among the points of Sir Flinders Petrie's argument. What of the future? he asks and, as we understand him, answers that in some future civilisation perhaps a new type of man may, by the careful segregation of fine types, be bred who will in turn start a new and more viable civilisation. This hope seemed remote and very forlorn, even from the pre-war point of view. More than miracles, we now see, would be needed to fulfil it.

But a little while ago, two optimists, interpreting the Spenglerian philosophy of history,[1] were looking to Russia to break the vicious circle of rising, declining, and falling civilisations, but by this time they probably realise that the more things have changed in Russia, the more they are the same thing, and very much more so. The world, the flesh, and the devil are operative under every human system of government and all over the earth. This, indeed, the new world, no less than the old, can testify, for civilisation on the American continent, in spite of its fresh start and its freedom from the traditions and historical entanglements of the older lands, is confronted by the same problems. Whether the world, the flesh and the devil were stowaways on the "Mayflower," or whether these undesirables gained later entrance, despite the wisest provisions of the immigration law, they are there—flourishing under the Stars and Stripes as under the Union Jack, and under every flag that flies. This problem is of planetary extent, as well as ages old.

The above-mentioned essay on Spengler's philosophy of history claims further reference as a characteristic modern view of history in all its

[1] *Civilisation or Civilisations,* E. H. Goddard and P. A. Gibbons. Introduction by Professor F. C. S. Schiller.

tenses. Its authors declare that "past history teaches us to expect the fossilisation and staticisation of our own as of other cultures" and think it doubtful if we can do anything to prevent this. At the moment, they say, "we are still pursuing knowledge and have reached the conclusion that man must look to himself for aid." Then come these words: "European thought has not eliminated God, but has discounted Him. . . . At the very least it is felt that as far as this world is concerned there is no hope of assistance from the heavens and that man must work out his own destiny."

Strange, this *"no assistance from the heavens,"* at the very time when signs and portents loudly" speak of that promised divine descent—"when men shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. . . ."

Donning a prophetic mantle, one well-known novelist and publicist duly warns of troubles to come, saying the world is "not on the way to peace," but to a series of wars which may "culminate in some new world war," the victory of flight creating new fears rather than new hopes; the very peacemakers being afraid to move one step toward disarmament lest they find themselves unarmed among their enemies and "who shall say

they are wrong, looking at the mind and morals of the world," for though the environment of man changes, man himself "remains essentially the same." But what is his remedy? None: he foresees nothing better than an "eternal struggle between good and evil," now one side winning and now the other, but good never really and finally victorious. In a word, he foresees no Kingdom of Heaven upon earth. This is pessimism, indeed. Nevertheless—"Thy kingdom come on earth!" And it will come, for Christ who taught us thus to pray has promised to return as the effectual answer to the prayer. . . .

There was a time when millennial hopes were based upon a changed system of government, but now we realise that at one time or other every system has been tried and found wanting,—monarchy, autocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and dictatorship, including even the "dictatorship of the proletariat." Once the brightest hope of all, democracy itself is being now abandoned in some lands and sternly criticised in all, even a British prime minister giving warning of the difficulty, not so much of making the world safe for democracy, as of making democracy safe for the world! The monster wars of modern times are the fruit of democracy, some folk are saying, because, so they

argue, these clashes not of the smaller armies of old days but of whole peoples, enregimented for battle, came in with the democratic régime, the idea of universal suffrage carrying with it the idea of universal soldiering. Democracy, so far, has certainly not fulfilled the hope that it would prevent, or even reduce, the horror of war. Is not that because the human nature of the masses is the same as the human nature of a privileged few? Democracy, they say again, risks degeneracy into demagogy, described by some as the mortal scourge of civilisations, inasmuch as the true interests of the nation are sacrificed by demagogues bidding for popular support. How we are governed matters less than who governs us, is one theory, and a few short years ago great things were hoped by the workers, as they are called, as the result of their own control of public affairs. They have now tried their hand in various parts of the world, and their human limitations have been discovered by themselves and by others, for, of course, the human nature of the labour element is the same as every one else's human nature.

Women are, in government, the least tried and tested human force, and already more than one man has prophesied that through the efforts of enfranchised women will come a new world-

age of righteousness and peace. What can and will women citizens do for civilisation? Clearly they will, as far as possible, adjust their environment to their own requirements, especially by ridding themselves of any artificial handicaps put upon them by law and custom in the economic struggle for existence. But the larger question is, will women regenerate the existing civilisation and thus, as it were, repeal the old, old law of the decline and fall of civilisation? That is expecting much! The maidens of the fairy tales, it is, who perform the most extraordinary tasks, but even they depend on fairy aid.

How should women succeed where generations of men have failed? Only human as they are, women cannot overpower superhuman evil. Part and parcel of humanity, they, like men, are not exempt from sin: they share the same human nature. Their lately gained freedom, for all its justice and the real advantages it brings them, nevertheless gives more rein and scope to their human nature, and thus subjects them to greater temptation. The characteristic errors and failings of women, if they differ from those of men, may also prove dangerous to civilisation. One thing women's vote will surely teach them and it is that there is something wrong with the world

that is beyond their human power to cure. But for our enfranchisement, we might have supposed that the world was waiting simply for the touch of woman's hand upon the steering wheel to go aright. Emphatically, we are not disappointed in votes for women; but government, in this modern world especially, is a more than superhuman task: it is truly a task beyond all save God in person. The strongest and wisest, whether men or women, can do no more than strive to hold the fort until Christ's coming. His parable serves to show. Jesus spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem and they thought that the Kingdom of God would immediately appear. He said therefore: A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.[1] The nobleman who goes away to come back again as king—this is the Lord Jesus Christ in his first and second advents. While he is away, as the next verse of the parable has it, his charge is: "Occupy till I come." This charge grows heavier just as the time draws near for his return.

Peace between nations, for example, was never so difficult to ensure. Nothing is so easy as to cry peace, peace, but it does not come for our mere

[1] St. Luke 19:12.

calling. Indeed, women, the more they desire peace, may have to beware of playing a Red Riding-hood rôle in international affairs, whether at the expense of their own country or of another threatened by the wolf. It is too soon to say whether enfranchised women in general will restrain their respective countries from aggressive war, but presuming that they do, there are still peoples whose women do not, and perhaps for a long time will not, exert the same influence as women in the most western lands. Besides, what people ever will confess to waging a war of aggression? In every war, all the parties protest that they are defending justice and right, and claim to be clean of hand and pure in heart. There is at least a possibility that the women, like the men, of an aggressor nation will persuade themselves that theirs is, even if in a roundabout way, a wholly righteous war. . . . Wars of defence, wars of liberation have always had women's support. Boadicea and Joan of Arc are warriors held in great honour by women to this day. Women's war service abounded from 1914 to 1918. Russia had even a small fighting force of volunteer women, and to-day Red Russia has many women workers. In future wars, women, like all civilians, will suffer the whole shock of

air attack and other modern horrors; who can tell how this will affect their view as to self and home defence, at least.

In estimating women's political influence in the world to-day, account must be taken of the present decline of democracy and rise of dictatorship. Because, in proportion as democracy declines, women's newly acquired voting power is nullified. If democracy is doomed, the vote so hardly won, so lately grasped, crumbles by an irony of political fate as Dead Sea fruit in the hand. Lands that are likely never to see one-man rule are, it will be said, the Mother of Parliaments and the United States, but of what other lands on earth would any one assert the same? Under a dictatorship, whether of one or of a group, such hoped-for restraints upon war as the "women's vote" would be inoperative, and even with us, there exist extra-political influences, which, concurrent with the power of the vote, have their share in prompting national policies. The very multiplication of votes is reducing their value, was dismally hinted by the London *Times,* at the moment when the British government brought in the bill to make five and a quarter million new voters and place women in the electoral majority. Do votes lose in force what they gain in number?

asked the *Times*. Is government ostensibly by the more, becoming in fact government by the fewer? Does the extension of democracy eventually mean its involuntary abdication? Will extremes meet, seems to be the thought, and democracy find itself resolved into a *de facto* dictatorship?

"He shall rule over thee"—the ancient curse, pronounced upon the woman, now gives place to modern freedom, and though in this Age that can never wholly suffice, this change in woman's status may count perhaps as one more sign of the times.

The British prime minister in offering the measure of Womanhood Suffrage, said to a meeting of suffragists: "Many of you look for a new heaven and a new earth. I have been too long in politics to take the apocalyptic view."

Women, also, have outgrown, if we ever had it, the idea that we can make all things new. Yet, to those whose eyes are opened, the apocalyptic vision increases with the signs of these times, lending courage and endurance to serve, each one at the post appointed, while awaiting the true apocalypse, "the revelation of Jesus Christ." [1]

"The government shall be upon his shoulder" [2] is the prophet's word of comfort for women

[1] I Peter 1:13. [2] Isaiah 9:6.

citizens called to take up that heavy burden in these difficult and even perilous times: the prospect gives heart in the meantime and courage to "hold fast that which is good." . . .

Nearest to the cross, earliest at the tomb, first with the news that He was risen—loyal women have a like privilege to-day: Now, as then, it is theirs to see; it is theirs to "Go quickly and tell!" . . .

"Yea, and certain women also . . . made us astonished," but we "found it even so as the women had said." [1]

When one comes to think of it, everything has been tried on earth, except the royal return of Christ. Nobody can even imagine any new experiment in ordering world affairs. What at first sight may seem new, proves really to be old. Even modern revolutions, whether of the "right" or of the "left," are admittedly mere revivals of old ideas and ways, and there is no revolutionary theory or movement, it has been said, which "does not ultimately employ itself in bringing life to ghosts and putting the Present to school with the Past."

Why does humanity return upon its own tracks, running round and round its squirrel cage? Why

[1] St. Luke 24:22, 24.

cannot the peoples move forward, leaving wars and social strife and crime and vice and envy and unkindness far behind?

"The changeless human mind," as the Lord Chief Justice of England has called it—and he should know something of the human mind and its ways—this mind, then, is responsible for making history thus repeat itself. As there is nothing new under the sun, nothing modern except perhaps certain scientific inventions, there is, says the Lord Chief Justice, "no contemporary puzzle or problem upon which the ancient classics do not throw their light" and there is "no essential problem of humanity" which the Greeks and Romans had not to face. But even if to-day's problem is old, why cannot the sages invent at least a new solution? Because they cannot deal with the factor of the sin of the world. Therefore only one solution is possible, and that the divine solution, Christ's coming and reign!

Yet, for all their helplessness in face of it, our sages are haunted by the problem of the world and its future. The peoples of to-day, says Dr. Gustave Le Bon, in his *Evolution Actuelle du Monde,* find themselves between a world that is ending and a world which is about to begin, and in the throes of a conflict between the forces of

conservation and the forces of destruction. The very existence of civilisation, he insists, is menaced by the new means of warfare, which constitute a peril such as the world has never before known. Meanwhile, statesmen since 1918 have been trying to assure peace but have not succeeded, and indeed their effort is not new, for after previous wars, exhausted nations have sought to associate themselves for the prevention of further war. Yet although it has always been easy to prove that the nations have a greater interest in helping than in destroying one another, reason plays but a feeble rôle in political life and this rôle has weakened still further since the predominance of collective forces which is characteristic of democracy. Such is Dr. Le Bon's gloomy view, and he even thinks that "the wars of the future will perhaps arise through the unloosing of popular fury, sweeping away in an instant all the conventions laboriously erected by the diplomats." Moreover, he fears lest "the most dangerous struggles of the future be internal wars arising out of popular revolutions." Again, with the present interdependence of nations, the least rivalries even between very small nations may unchain a universal conflict.

"To govern is to foresee" is a true saying, Dr.

Le Bon admits, but he laments that "there is no brain vast enough to foresee the future." The value of Biblical prophecy is that it enables us to foresee, but Dr. Le Bon, however far forward he would strain his own eye, has not yet advanced so far as to study prophecy and thus view the future through the eyes of God. Without pretending, as he says, to read in the book of destiny, he assembles certain factors which seem as though they must influence the future of the world.

International relations, he continues, are full of uncertainty: it avails nothing to a people to wish for peace if its neighbours wish for war; a government desirous of war easily finds a pretext for provoking one or getting war declared against itself: in any future warfare the civil population will certainly suffer more than the armies: conferences and leagues strive for peace between rival nations, but no one seems concerned to prevent internal wars, which are as dangerous as wars between nations. Far from counting democracy safe for the world, Dr. Le Bon considers that one of the great dangers of the age is the influence of the masses on the national policy, for their sentiments, he thinks, are violent, their reason weak, and their power to foresee completely nil, while modern statesmen govern only from day to day.

Such being the present, according to Dr. Le Bon, what thinks he of the future? He foresees the "reappearance of the ancient autocratic régime known as Dictatorship." The dictators of various lands are likely to arise in the parties of the "left," but in any case the peoples will be "reduced to choosing between a fascist, a military or a communist dictatorship," and the system of dictatorship tends to spread and become international. . . . But when all is said, "history is dominated by the unforeseeable," sighs this philosopher, who wonders, though he does not predict, by what new ideal mankind will henceforth be inspired. Finally, he makes for the old and too familiar materialist's mirage, "the dawn of a new humanity sufficiently evolved to understand, with the first causes of things, the formidable mysteries with which the world is still enveloped." No comfort there! No word of a divine visitation to bring peace and righteousness to earth! What a relief, intellectual as well as spiritual, to turn to the positive, realist, practical, constructive Biblical prophecies of the return of Jesus Christ!

Many thinkers do not point us even to a mirage, as for instance, an English public man who wrote to the London *Times* of the impression, "to-day widespread," that life in the pres-

ent conditions of the world is on the whole "a long war in the night," and questioned: "Are the springs of fertility drying up in the souls of men and women . . . is their faith in the social order and perhaps in life itself shaken at its foundations?" Such a diagnosis may be less true of the younger nations of the world, but then with nations, as with men and women, youth does not last forever, and certain troubles are not less prominent in new countries than in old ones. We who see in the signs of the times the message that the Kingdom of Christ is coming have a great longing to share this good news with all those others who know nothing of it and find their hope of the future turning to despair.

The world's eldest statesman, M. Clemenceau —after his long career in politics and its close in triumph—has *he* discerned some golden future of human making? The present he paints in rather sombre colours. The world, he considers, is not and never has been governed by anything but oligarchies of interests, including oligarchies of democracy; to establish institutions on paper and to carry them out in the spirit are two different things, and the discord between words and deeds is the worst of our troubles. War seems to him imposed by the universal struggle for exist-

ence and man's very tools are tools of peace or of war as occasion requires. You may enquire, says he, of every age of history and you will find there nothing but successions of peace and of war: the very progress made in time of peace enables the development of engines of war by which the effect of massacres is indefinitely multiplied. The aged statesman appears to hope little from present efforts toward peace. Just as the Amphictyonic council of Delphos, charged with keeping peace among the Greeks, failed, he seems to think its modern counterparts in a wider international field may also fail, especially should an aggressor nation prove to be the only one prepared for war. The nations are so far even from internal peace that we cannot seriously count upon a profound *entente* between peoples whose whole history was, and is still, a history of perpetual dissensions: let us aim at peace, but beware lest in doing so we increase the chances of new catastrophes which might be worse than those that went before. So much for the present, but what of the future? Disclaiming the title of pessimist, and unwilling to engender pessimism in others, M. Clemenceau's concluding note is the conventional one: Evolution—the evolution of

the human species, and of its ways and works, toward some better goal.

After all, a statesman must whistle to keep other people's spirits up, if not his own! One who has not recognised that the world's future is dependably foretold in Bible prophecy is apt either to preach sheer pessimism, or buoy people up with evolutionary myth and legend about the future, as does M. Clemenceau. Even so, he has felt in duty bound to give warning that "the idea of an infinite human evolution cannot be deduced from recognised laws," and asks: "Can we not conceive that our evolution may be exhausted before the hour of a planetary transformation! . . . When the environment became too different, the dinosaurus, the archaeopteryx and many other creatures, having foreseen nothing, saw their history finish. They would doubtless have regretted it, had they been, like ourselves, able to philosophise."

So the evolutionary future, without a divine regnant intervention by Christ, is not without its risks, nor is it brilliant!

Still less consoling are some even vaguer philosophies of the future, preached here and there —a sort of Beyond-the-Beyondism—conceptions which for being grandiose are not the less vacu-

ous, because there is no God at the heart of them; cloud turrets of figurative phraseology, having no power to pacify nations and nature and bring righteousness upon earth.

If there were nothing better—if there were no God, no Jesus Christ, then poor forlorn humanity might well try to invent some form of words wherewith to hide, or at least disguise, the awful truth of its desolate helplessness in presence of giant impersonal forces that drive men into the world and out again, and, while they are in the world, make such strange sport with them. In that awful case, the following words of a Bernard Shaw character might be pathetically gallant; as it is they are unprofitable:

> "Of life only there is no end; and though of its million starry mansions many are empty and many are still unbuilt, and though its vast domain is as yet unbearably desert, my seed shall one day fill it and master its matter to its uttermost confines. And for what may be beyond, the eyesight of Lilith is too short. It is enough that there is a beyond."

As a faith and hope for the future, this is decidedly too vague. And how very credulous are

such as this Lilith of the Shaw play, compared to us more hard-headed folk who require some evidence for our belief, evidence supplied by the many historic events and present signs which, by fulfilling so much of prophecy, assure us that the whole will yet be fulfilled, even to the very coming of Christ Jesus in person. . . .

Humanistic philosophy eggs man on to contest with cosmic forces, assures him of victory, saying "we have faith in the power of man to rule his universe and to dominate the cosmic process." So this puny Titan, man, not even master of himself, defies and thinks to master the cosmos! How much more feasible and credible is the return of Christ in person, to amend the turbulent proceedings of both nature and human nature.

No statesmanship can offer any policy to match this for soundness and sheer practicability: No dreamer can conceive a nobler ideal. A foremost living poet [1] in his *Ode in the Day of Transition,* from which we cull some lines, makes an appeal—

"We are shaken with storms of fate.

. . . . . .

War smote us hard, and the hard blows of peace

[1] Sir William Watson.

Buffet our laden shoulders without cease.

. . . . . .

A world that from its deathbed clutched at spoils
Hath willed a ravelment unblest,
Which we must needs hand on (O dire bequest)
Tangled anew with deadlier knots and coils;

. . . . . .

We whom the wrangle we call peace embroils
With dissonance never mute;
We ask that thou of the clear eyes fulfil . . ."

This petition is, with a poet's partiality, addressed to Song. But would it not serve better as a prayer that Christ fulfil his promise to return? Poets, in verse or prose, none can show us any real good to come: their idealism cannot match with God's great idea for the world: their imagination cannot mount to the heights of divine fact. Even the Maeterlincks dare not dream the reality announced by God, confessing that they look for no one to come from another sphere to liberate the earth. This is false pessimism, as mistaken as the false optimism of Browning's

Pippa: God's in His heaven, all *will* be right with the world.

The future of the world will be what God makes it, according to Professor Whitehead, who writes, "The purpose of God is the attainment of value in the temporal world." Most true, but, if one may say so, a dry academic way of expressing it which, by omission, even makes for ambiguity. For what, or better still, *who* is value for God, and in what manner is He going to attain value in the temporal world? The Bible says it better, and there we clearly read [1] exactly and fully what is the purpose of God—we learn "His good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ."

[1] Ephesians 1:10.

CHAPTER VIII

The Churches and the Gospel of Christ's Return

GOOD news! "Men are longing for good news."[1] The churches have got the good news to give and now is the time to give it.

The Archbishops of the Church of England charged some of their "best and strongest" to discover how the evangelistic work of the Church can be extended and improved in this modern day. These enquired and reported thus:

> "If the Church is to preach to this generation an evangel which will grip, it must come in some sense as news—news powerful enough to change the whole mental and spiritual outlook. Good advice is not the same as good news. Men are longing for good news. . . ."

Very interesting, very curious is the whole report, which would fit the American, just as well as the English case. Whether its authors in-

[1] *The Evangelistic Work of the Church.* Report of the Archbishops' Third Committee of Enquiry.

tended it or no, it all proves the necessity of preaching the good news of the return and the Kingdom of Christ. This preaching He has explicitly commanded. "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end [consummation] of the age?" [1] asked his disciples, and after describing his royal return and the heralding signs thereof, he gave the prophetic command: This good news of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.[2]

The hour has struck for this preaching to begin. The signs heralding His return are already here. If the churches do not make haste to publish the good news of Christ's coming and kingdom, He may come upon them unawares. Even suppose that His coming is delayed longer than present signs suggest, the good news that He will come, some day, must now be preached, all the same!

Some hundreds of years, it was, from the first Christmas, back to Isaiah and his prophecy: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given . . . of the increase of his government and peace

[1] It should be needless to remark that the disciples did not ask concerning the end of the world, of the earth, and that the authorised translation, "the end of the world," is an incorrect translation and the word "age" is the correct one.

[2] St. Matthew 24:14.

there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom."[1] But the centuries passed and, sure enough, in the ripeness of time, the child was born, the Son of God was given.

Since he went away "to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return,"[2] nineteen centuries have elapsed—not a very long time, measured against the length of all known history. Compared to evolution's dawdling, its dangerous, dreadful dawdling, the waiting time, from the first promise of Christ's kingdom to this day, has lasted, relatively, but one heartbeat. Why, if Christ's return should still tarry yet two thousand more years, that great event would be closer in time than breathing, compared to the millions upon millions of years that, they tell us, evolution needs to do its work!

Good news, indeed! This alleged cosmic process of evolution, involving nature with all its turbulence, mankind with all its sin and sorrow, civilisation with all its strife and its tendency to decay—this cosmic process of evolution is not to be trusted, even after an eternity, as its protagonists confess, to lead to the Kingdom of God. If a possible delay is a reason for keeping silence about Christ's return to bring in his own king-

[1] Isaiah 9:6, 7. [2] St. Luke 19:12.

dom, then the drear and hopeless tidings of evolution ought never again to be heard in any pulpit. Yet still voices are heard insisting that they must and will modernise their message by adjusting Christianity to the "conception of evolution."

Evolutionist fanaticism should now cease. The Archbishops' Committee men say so in substance, for in discussing "the causes of the Church's weakness" they mention "superficial ideas about evolution, with a notion that everything is coming right in the end—a shallow fatalism. . . ."

Ministerial delving into a supposititious evolutionary origin assuredly does not explain man and the world as they are to-day, and still less as they will be to-morrow. Fossils or futurity—which should be the subject of "the message, which if it is to reach men to-day must be vitally related to the life of our time." [1]

The perspective is false, unless Christ's personal coming to reign is preached and in these days *emphasised.* By admission of the Archbishops' Committee, "there has been too little teaching of the truth as a whole, and as a result there has been a want of grasp and a lack of perspective" and "the Church's own failure to teach is largely responsible for numerous intel-

[1] Report of the Archbishops' Committee.

lectual difficulties which keep many from its membership."

Evil—the existence of evil in all its hideous forms—is the greatest of these intellectual difficulties. Christ's second coming to subdue evil is the only answer to the difficulty. The Church's failure to make that answer, as it should be made, is the supreme tragedy of her history. Always, always, always, throughout the Christian era and more than ever in the last hundred years, this intellectual, this moral difficulty of the existence of evil, and its persistence even since Calvary—has hindered humanity's vision "of our God and of his Christ."

A preaching that the Kingdom of Christ is already on earth, or that the Church is progressively bringing the kingdom in, amounts to the lamentable teaching that in the divine view the world as it is, with all its evil, is normal or approximating to the normal—that the Lord Jesus Christ will resort to no further decisive means, other than those now evident, to "take away the sin of the world." Unless his personal return to bring in his own kingdom is preached, Christ is misrepresented to mankind.

The Bishop of London tells how a British sea captain said to him: "If I kept my ship in the

condition in which God keeps His world, I should be dismissed from the service." What the bishop said to the sea captain is not known, but the answer is easy. The spick and span state of a British naval vessel is far-famed: you could eat off the deck, as they say—when there is a state of peace! But let a battle be raging and then what a difference, what havoc, a battered and shattered ship, men dishevelled and maimed—it's war.

Consider those pre-war fields, every inch ordered, cultivated, fertile, then invaded and trampled and trenched and turned into battlefields, fields of carnage, during four years of the great war!

This whole world is a battlefield; it is the scene of a mighty war against evil. Lesser wars have their decisive battle and their final battle, and these are apt not to be one and the same. The decisive battle of the great war was the Battle of the Marne, but though it determined the ultimate victory, it did not end the war, which raged incessantly for more than four years, until the final struggle in the autumn of 1918, the *second* Battle of the Marne, as it has been called. So with God's great war against sin? Its decisive battle was won by Jesus, the Son of God, and won

on the cross, a victory declared by His words: It is finished. But the divine war against evil, although won, was not yet ended. As in other lesser wars, the struggle continues and will continue until the final encounter, when the Victor of Calvary returns to reap the full harvest of victory which He sowed nineteen hundred years ago.

Such a man as John Stuart Mill declared himself unable, in view of the evil in the world, to believe in a Creator who is both all-*powerful* and all-*good*. Both he and his father, James Mill, would have found it easier to believe in two Powers, or supernatural Beings, one good, the other evil, struggling for the lordship of the world. The only way, thought John Stuart Mill, of reconciling belief in God with the condition of the world would be to assume that God is great but not all-powerful, for the belief in His goodness would be left to us, even if at the expense of His omnipotence. But how near, how very near was this idea to the truth! A triumphant Second Advent preaching by the churches, showing that God, although omnipotent and therefore finally to be victorious, is still, through the abuse of the free will He has given to created intelligences, confronted with rebellion, and is pursuing a war against the resultant evil—such

was and is the answer to be made to men of the calibre of John Stuart Mill.

Darwin thought cosmic violence and suffering an argument against the being of God. "Several English theologians," says Dr. Höffding in an interesting passage, "have recently embraced Darwin's theory, justifying themselves by saying that they restrict the creative act to the beginning of life, when the primitive form or forms arose, and that natural selection is for them the means established by God for the originating of particular species. Darwin himself, however, could not adopt this way out of the difficulty. No less than John Stuart Mill, he found it impossible to unite the sufferings and discords of the world with the providence of an omnipotent Being." Neither does God reconcile these sufferings and discords with His omnipotence and providence, and this sin-made chaos of rebellion will, as prophesied, be returned to order when Christ Jesus comes to bring in His Kingdom.

To-day, the grandson of Huxley writes of the Gordian knot in which man has tied up the absolute goodness and omnipotence of God with the evil in the world. This, says Julian Huxley, has always been a stumbling-block to belief, because when natural catastrophes occur, such as the Mis-

sissippi floods, great earthquakes, deadly epidemics, worse than all, a great war—then "it is difficult for many to believe in a personal God." The great war, pursues Julian Huxley, raised questionings as to how an all-wise, all-powerful, and all-loving God could possibly have allowed such a thing to be; this turned many away—either, they said, "there is no God or He is not good." To lift the "horror and contradiction" of it all, Mr. Huxley would use God merely as the name of "the universe as it impinges upon our lives and thoughts," and would abandon the idea of a personal God responsible for the manifold evils of the world.

To a modern outlook such as that, how can the churches reply, if not with the Messianic proclamation of their Lord's return to overthrow the evil in the world? Evolutionism as preached by the modernists is no answer to the challenge of Julian Huxley, for he already has his hereditary partiality for evolutionism. Modernism he has pronounced an "unsatisfactory mixture," because, he declares, "the theistic view has been watered down and has lost much of its power and savour, and the scientific outlook is not rigidly adhered to." He returns to the charge that evil exists and its existence is "a challenge to the moral

character of God." The doctrine of the Messiah is known to him, but he supposes the hope of Messiah's coming to have faded finally away, as well he might, considering that many pulpits are silent on the great theme. But Messianic expectancy is rekindled to-day by the very calamities Julian Huxley finds so terribly conspicuous—earthquakes, floods, the recent war, and danger of more war. Those precisely are the signs and the reasons of Messiah's approaching return!

Here is a challenge to men of science thrown down by myself as a student of the science of government, if I may so express it, who have for a whole decade past been testing Messianic prophecy by facts, by world events and conditions. Let men of science do the same thing, even for ten months! Let them first empty their mind of all preconceptions and then, in a genuinely scientific spirit of enquiry, compare the prophecies as they stand written, not only with the facts of the first advent but also with recent events and conditions, beginning at the Balfour Declaration in 1917. Let this comparative study of prophecy and the current events of the days as they pass continue for one year from the date of reading this page! This enthralling investiga-

tion, once begun, will not be relinquished: it is safe to prophesy that! So extraordinary have the Messianic portents now become, that once the prophetic clue is given, even to an incredulous or hostile person, he or she cannot help studying these portents, though this study be unconfessed.

Those Christian ministers who really wish, as they express it, to come to terms with "the modern outlook" are bound to explain the problem of evil, for, as one of them has admitted, the great difference between to-day and his own young days is "that our leaders then believed that all was well with the world: to-day, if there is one thing of which all those whose eyes are open at all are afraid, it is that things are very bad with the world." Then, obviously, the modern task of the churches is to teach in what way God intends to make things really well with the world, and by this Messianic preaching to answer the typically modern philosopher who says: "The problem of evil seems to involve either that God (if there is one) is not all good or that He is not omnipotent."

The ambassadors of Christ[1] must make dignified reply: Our King Himself is coming to reign, and in those days will it be said:

[1] II Corinthians 5:20.

"The Lord reigneth: let the earth rejoice. . . . The heavens declare his righteousness and all the people see his glory."

The case goes by default unless the return of Christ is shown as the cure for the world's evil. Apology for evil is fatal. Yet often apology seems to listeners to be made. A bishop admits that "unwelcome, disconcerting, relentless, looms the fact of evil, like a hideous octopus fastening its tentacles upon every individual, every society, every relationship of life, and with that poisonous clutch come the attendant abominations of sin, pain, disease and death, and though God surely cannot and will not tolerate evil, yet it continues and to all appearance its grasp is in no way relaxed." Thereupon he truly says that by the crucifixion of Christ we have the measure of the divine condemnation of evil—but as to the cause and origin and the termination of evil he is silent, merely remarking that out of evil good can come. Yes, but only upon condition that evil will eventually be abolished. All Christians have many times discovered during their present pilgrim's progress that God makes *all* things work together for good to them that love Him. We even know that our Lord's perfection flowered in

the bitter sunshine of adversity and that our own imperfection can be gradually chastened by the same. Blest are the uses of affliction in the sense of driving folk to feel the need of God and to make their first acquaintance with Him who says: "I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction." [1] But for evil to go drifting and dragging on indefinitely would not and could not be consistent with God's goodness, and the very idea would, of course, be a denial that the Kingdom of God is ever coming upon earth.

Evil is as real as any other part of our experience, insists a modern philosopher, and it must be taken seriously, whatever problem that may raise for our thought. Now although a certain number of people are heard to affirm the existence of discarnate spirit beings, of whom not all are good, there is a very widespread reluctance to admit that these may include that one, set forth in the Bible as the arch-sinner, the supernatural author and instigator of sin. Evil, but no Devil, seems to be the idea—yet do not past history and modern experience supply at least circumstantial evidence of the being and the doing of an evil intelligence, volition, and power? Human experience certainly supplies an analogy, for all or-

[1] Isaiah 48:10.

ganisations—business, governmental, religious—suffer upheaval through the presence of any disloyal, rebellious steward, and the higher his place, the greater his dignity, and the larger his responsibility, the more this is true, so that it is with vast difficulty, and not too speedily, that the problem is solved and he and his mischief eliminated from the situation—the more so that evident justice and the utmost forbearance must be shown even to such an one.

The modern philosopher who insists that evil is at any rate real, as real as any other part of our experience, adds: "It is no consolation at all, but may even be felt as a mockery, to be told that from the point of view of God or the Absolute, all is good." Christian Ministers must therefore beware of seeming to give such a message as that!

Apocalyptic preaching, frank, courageous, is the Church's duty in the face of the evil in the world. If another war comes, what else can clergy and ministers say to a world in agony? "The war to end war" slogan will never serve again. Nothing will serve but the comforting good news that Jesus, divine Prince of Peace, will come again in his might and "make wars to cease

unto the end of the earth."[1] Boldly, faithfully prophesy Christ's personal coming and reign—or else you are driven by opponents of the truth into a corner, O, ministers of Christ! and reduced to the feeble cry: "You make too much of pain and suffering, you exaggerate its importance." But God Himself makes much of pain and suffering. Jesus, in His first advent, made much of pain and suffering and sorrow—Jesus, when He beheld the city, wept over it! Who are we, then, to make light of it, to tolerate it, apologise for it all, as "necessary evil," as though it were a permanent part of God's scheme of things for this earth!

Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth: the dictation of this prayer was the announcement that evil, violence, pain, suffering, sorrow will at last be banished from the earth. It is true that human beings do directly cause much world evil by their deliberate sin—and then some of them rail against God for permitting the evil. These want freedom without responsibility! They want freedom from allegiance and obedience to a personal God, and at the same time they want to hold Him responsible for the evil they themselves have caused. The Churches are entitled to rebuke this inconsistency, but they do not

[1] Psalm 46:9.

thereby complete their task—because evil is a still bigger problem than that!

A peasant or a mother and her children, whose country is invaded by a hostile army, cry out despairingly: "Why! Then what answer have the Churches to give, except: Christ is coming again; He too has suffered, and suffered most, in this age-long war with evil: but its end will come when He returns, bringing in His kingdom." Nothing else and nothing less will do for a reply.

The reason for that is that where evil is concerned, the main issue is not pain and suffering: it is the Holiness of God. This the simplest layman knows and the wisest cleric ought to admit.

> "O Lord my God, mine Holy One. . . . Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity . . . And the Lord answered me, and said: Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and shall not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry. . . ." [1]

The message confided to the prophet was of the coming of One who shall put down un-

[1] Habakkuk 1:13; 2:2, 3.

righteousness and of an earth filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord. . . .

It does not honour God to minimise the evil in the world; nor does it impress the men and women of to-day. "No generation," admits an ecclesiastic writing on evil, "has been more violently convinced than has this one, of the horror and cruelty and lust which accompany the march of life, and no religion which has not its explanation to offer will appeal to any save the superficial and childish." His own explanation is that "out of evil springs good: through suffering there is revealed love and love victorious" and he points to the cross of Christ as being the demonstration of victorious love. But an effectual victory means that the conquered enemy is made to cease from troubling. What puzzles folk is why, if Christ was, on the cross, victorious over evil, this conquered enemy still wanders to and fro in the earth. Yet the reason is simplicity itself, if the churches would only give it. The conquered foe is already judged though still at large, sentence not being yet carried out; he is conquered and the Victor, when he returns, will fully make good his victory.

Nature's violent outbreaks, with their tragic consequences, are another form of evil whose place in the divine order of things people want

the churches to explain. The Rev. Dr. Scott Lidgett goes a certain way but then stops short. "Men are," says he, "more than ever alive to the sufferings inflicted by the convulsions of nature." Assuredly they are—because convulsions of nature are conspicuous among the now present signs of the *need* and of the *fact* of Christ's approaching return! Formerly, when nature was more peaceful, observes Dr. Scott Lidgett, "evolution, because of its orderly naturalism, seemed to dispense with the necessity of God." But in the "recent troubled years," a somewhat different idea has been developing and, as he says, "the main difficulty has been the acceptance of a Theistic interpretation which, while presuming the spiritual perfection which is essential to the Idea of God, can explain the whole of existence and not merely certain selected elements which are favourable to this interpretation. Faith has been shaken." A marvellous admission follows—pointing logically and directly to the necessity of preaching Christ's coming. Here is Dr. Scott Lidgett's admission:

> "Hence the craving for something tangible, something presented to or bound up with perception through the senses, which may enable men to say of the manifestation of spiritual

> Reality, 'Lo, it is here' or 'Lo, it is there,' either as a substitute for, or as an assistance to belief that the Kingdom of God is within you."

Seeing is believing, in fact! The visible return of Christ will be "perceptible through the senses." So was His first advent: "The Word was God . . . and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us . . . which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes . . ."[1] The only difference is that next time He will come to earth, not in ordinary, but in extraordinary fashion, not in humility and weakness, but in His Godly power. And since men and women thus crave for his coming, why should not the churches let them know that he will come! Otherwise, they may be led astray by the false call, Lo! here, or lo! there, into allegiance to a false Christ, of which very danger the true Christ has given warning.

"Signs are everywhere manifest," pursues Dr. Scott Lidgett, of "this *imperious craving to bring the spiritual within the realm of the sensory in order to establish its certainty and nearness.*" The Incarnation satisfies that craving of man to behold God, because, in His advents, Jesus, the embodi-

[1] St. John 1:1, 14; I John 1:1.

ment of the fulness of the Godhead, did bring and will again bring the Godhead within the realm of the sensory, in order to establish, as a fact of common human experience, and so of common human knowledge, the certainty and nearness of God.

Never with such passionate insistence as now, writes a clergyman describing himself as a modern churchman, has mankind asked the question, what place can the volcano or famine or cancer hold in any benevolent scheme of the world: and what explanation consistent with a providential order can be given of the fact that "the pride and greed and cruelty of a few men could turn half Europe into a hell." Yet there is comfort in all this trouble, although this modern churchman does not yet share it and strangely says that good and evil are "so related that we cannot think of one without the other." The real comfort is that these very evils he names portend the coming of Christ to establish unconditionally His own benevolent and providential order, in which earthquake, famine, pestilence, war will find no place. As the prophet has it, a King shall reign in righteousness . . . and the work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance for ever.

"The Church must believe in the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth not as a far-off dream, but as a present possibility," declare the Archbishops' Committee and of course they cannot, in the light of experience, mean that either Church or State can bring the kingdom in—especially as they add: "Our age is asking to see Jesus Christ."

Certainly it would be useless to preach that the churches can establish Christ's kingdom, for no one would believe it. Truly the churches, in their own way, need his second coming nearly as much as does the world. "The life of the Church," says the Bishop of New York, Dr. Manning, "is at this moment of history, enfeebled, her witness weakened, her message in a high degree discredited by her own differences and divisions: unable to speak with a corporate voice, unable to give a united testimony, she cannot meet the deep need of the world to-day and do her true work for Christ." An English bishop concurs: "Some nineteen centuries have passed since the Prince of Peace came to dwell among men and yet we seem very far from peace. The nations are still arming: the Church is still rent with disunion."

Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world

. . . echoes the Master's voice down the nineteen centuries. I will come again. When ye see these things, evil at its height, earthquake, famine, and pestilence, wars and rumours of wars—then look up, lift up your heads, in the sure knowledge that I, your Redemption, am coming, that I, the very Kingdom of God, am nigh at hand. So we turn a deaf ear to the sad and pagan story told by one modern philosopher of gloom that "the form of the higher life is a conflict . . . evil will not vanish" and "any attempt to define the historic goal as a complete mundane good is entangled in hopeless inconsistencies"—this followed by the affirmation that complete good "lies beyond the present world-order in the supramundane sphere." This last remark is true enough, but then it is the divine, historic mission of Jesus, as God incarnate, to bring down supramundane good into the mundane sphere—in other words, to establish the Kingdom of God on earth.

Why? This tragic question must be answered, or the churches abdicate. The very children are challenging you, bishops and Free Church leaders.

"Won't some one tell me why this had to happen to me!" A little girl's voice is speaking. A victim, trapped, unspeakably maltreated, then killed, this child wrote from her place of trial a

letter to her father and mother. It is a unique document: in its terse eloquence, its poignant reticence, it deserves to rank with all the famous recorded utterances of the human soul. The letter makes known, not so much the outrage of a little girl's body, as her outraged sense of justice, her impassioned protest against the wrong that corrupts the cosmos, the wrong at the core of things. "Won't some one tell me why this had to happen to me!" What a challenge to the churches, this insistent cry of a child who being dead yet speaketh: "Won't some one tell me *why!*" Won't bishops and Free Church leaders tell her and tell us why, when the twentieth century is already some three decades on its way, little girls are still at the abominable mercy of lust and murderous perversity and why famine, earthquake, war mow down the children with the aged. For this little American girl is but one of a host of other till now inarticulate victims, to whom she has at last given voice by her appeal, not so much for pity as against sin, by her righteous challenge, *Why?* Putting philosophy itself to shame, this child in the throes of an ordeal far more than Socratic, outshone the philosophers of all ages, transpiercing all false optimism, putting

to shame all easy platitudes by her tremendous *Why?*

Why? Because the war against evil is still raging. Why? Because Christ is not yet come again in that power of his "whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." [1]

Another good bishop, in his turn, also asks how we are to "reconcile the basic idea of God as Love, with the facts of life as presented by the World War," and he instantly and rightly points in reply to the cross, the "eternal emblem of God's self-chosen expression of Love that was not mere sentiment, but a deliberate facing of the consequences of sin, a Love that met the demands of Righteousness." Agreed, agreed! But why not tell all the rest, why not give the further tidings, that upon the foundation of righteousness provided by his cross, the same Jesus will build his righteous kingdom when he comes again the second time!

That, in its fulness, is the good and the best news for these troubled times.

[1] Philippians 3:21.

CHAPTER IX

Answers to Objections

VARIOUS contrary arguments can now be answered. What has been called the negative aspect of the higher criticism can have nothing to say on prophecy as fulfilled in the advents of Christ. For the content of prophecy is just as true, and its fulfilment just as sure, whether there were one, two or twenty Isaiahs. Post-exilic or not, the Psalms, with their predictive glimpses of Messiah, all were written before His birth, death, resurrection, and His still future return. The Book of Daniel, whenever and by whomsoever written, is truly prophetic, because it reflects in advance international developments taking place in this our own time. Higher criticism is, moreover, itself on trial to-day. Although it is a German product, we must remember that nowhere has it been so unsparingly attacked as in Germany, and by Hegel, who held that it puts "subjective fancies in the place of historical data," fancies remarkable for the "scantiness of the particulars upon which they are based, on the per-

emptoriness with which they contradict the best known facts of history," the "higher" critic "extorting from the records something which was not in the matter recorded."

To-day's drastic and wholesale overhauling of the sciences is bound to be extended to the higher criticism, especially as post-war excavation in the Bible lands, which is only at the beginning of its truth-revealing task, is repeatedly bringing to light of day concrete proofs of Biblical statements. Archæological evidence, as well as the evidence of present-day signs, must obviously be decisive as against any higher critical negations.

A halt, in passing, at "comparative religion," just to enquire which of the multitudinous non-Biblical religions to which Christianity has been compared can "show the things that are to come hereafter!" The Biblical challenge to rivals is precisely that: "Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods: . . . let them shew us what shall happen . . . or declare us things for to come!" [1]

The vogue just now is to trace religion from a paltry origin, in crude, primitive human minds, but if, as it is more reasonable to believe, religion began with a divine revelation, then this original

[1] Isaiah 41:23, 22.

and ancient revelation must, it is also reasonable to believe, have announced a divine incarnation, redemption, and reign. It is easy to see how all rival religions would make this original revelation their pattern, however important might be their departures therefrom. There may yet be a revival of the thought expressed by Gladstone that "the greater gods of the ancient religions are to a large extent deteriorated and corrupted reproductions of the original divine idea as to both Creator and Redeemer, to which we may add, impersonations of the abstract or of external nature, deifications of the deceased, and personified conceptions of the evil agent or agents." The idea that Biblical teachings are borrowed from other cults and traditions is utterly topsy-turvy.

Fear of being mistaken keeps some preachers silent on the second coming. Mistaken they cannot be! Even a premature expectancy is not a mistaken one. Many ministers say: I believe He will come again, but I do not know when: meanwhile I am very busy with the work of converting people, which I cannot give up for the sake of preaching His second coming. But less and less can they convert people, unless they *do* preach His second coming, because only thus can they convince this generation of the holiness of God and

the reality of the Lord Jesus Christ. *When* Christ will come again really matters less than the fact that *eventually* he will come to take his great power and reign and thereby put an end to the present evil world-order.

Nowadays, sermons to non-Christians which leave the second advent out of account will miss their mark. At the longest, the time of waiting for the advent will not be long, as some reckon time, and any parson who has the heart to ask a troubled generation to hope in evolution's hypothetical and endlessly slow process, should surely have the faith to preach, instead, the better hope of the coming and the Kingdom of Christ. Besides, we have reasons to believe in his early coming which others had not, who expected his coming in their day. When he was expected on past occasions, the Jews were not, as they are now, returning in certain numbers to Palestine. The Zionist movement, the Balfour Declaration, the Jewish settlements in the promised land, the revival of Hebrew as the national tongue—all this and much more, was non-existent when, in 1000 A.D., and at other moments in history, believers cherished a hope of their Lord's return, which was not yet to be fulfilled. This unprecedented Jewish sign differentiates the present expectancy

from any other. Even the other present signs of His coming, though these are not in their nature so unprecedented as is the Jewish sign, are more prominent than when formerly Christians were stirred to advent expectancy.

Because the world is more completely involved, a world crisis must now be more serious than ever before. Communication being easier, swifter, by bringing peoples into closer contact has, alas! the effect of increasing friction. Scientific invention gives to men the means and weapons of annihilation. The age-old struggle for world power is like glowing embers which a breeze may fan to a blaze. Nature increases disorder with earthquake, flood, storm. Is not material here for tribulation such as the world has never known? May not the very predicted moment be near when, as men's hearts are failing them, their eyes will see the regnant Christ appear!

Plainly, there is a case for discerning the signs of the times! . . .

The conciseness of the Apostles' Creed obscures to some minds the fact that the approaching Messianic advent is distinguishable from that still more distant universal re-ordering of which a glimpse is given. The millennial Kingdom of Christ, needed and destined to replace the present

order, will be a period of world history whose perfections we all, perhaps, used to think could be realised by our human efforts.

The Church, it has been taught by some, is the Kingdom of Christ in the millennial sense and this idea it partly was that misled the expectant ones of 1000 A.D. Their argument was that the Lord would come, not to establish His kingdom upon earth, but after one thousand years from His birth, the Church, as His kingdom, having existed on earth during His absence, and thus their expectancy had a very different basis from the expectancy of to-day.

The hope of our Lord's coming has never been so widely shared as it is this time. Greater numbers are watching and waiting. Perhaps, too, they are more representative, being found in all parts of Christendom and in every denomination. Behind those who believe and openly declare that the great event is near, there are many more who wonder, who ponder the signs, whose minds are ripening to belief.

"He is always coming"—thus some will parry our argument. He comes, they say, "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup" [1]—but in the same verse the Apostle explains that this is

[1] I Corinthians XI:26.

only "till He come" in the completeness of His appearing, in His unveiled presence. "He comes at death," they also say, and so said Stephen, the first martyr: nevertheless He has announced his coming in such fashion that men shall one and all and together see him. "He comes again in seasons of religious revival," say others who think they have said all; but those comings are only typical of his antitypical and personal coming which will mean the greatest of all religious revivals.

"He came in 70 A.D. and has come in other seasons of calamity," is another saying. This almost seems to mean "calamity is His coming," a most distressing thought, but then follows their argument that with calamity some good comes and remains after it has ceased, as though when a conflagration burns out, gold should be found among the ashes. Even on this showing, it can be maintained that a culminating calamity should issue in a culminating good, namely, the coming and Kingdom of Christ in the complete and literal sense.

Some are strangely content to think that the Kingdom of Jesus Christ is "not of this world." Hapless world, left to its own devices, deprived of the heavenly King! But there is misunder-

standing here. Christ's answer to Pilate—my kingdom is not of this world—did not mean, my kingdom will *never* be of this world. Rather did it mean, what His own parable had already taught, that He was going away "to receive a kingdom, and to return." But *now* is my kingdom not from hence—Pilate was told.[1] He must first suffer, first drink the bitter cup, before He should re-enter into His heavenly glory[2] or enter into His earthly glory and kingdom. The Age must end, before earth could know the new Age and be the scene of His kingdom. Not by world-given, man-given power will He reign, for His kingdom of earth, when it comes, will be of heavenly origin and will not be conferred upon Him by the world.

"God can only act through the lives of men and women and He counts upon *us* to bring in His kingdom," is the queerest of all the arguments against the need of Christ's personal coming and rule. There is more sentimentality than sense in this way of thinking. Why is the Kingdom of God not on earth long since, if folk like us can bring it in? Nineteen centuries gave us our chance, which we did not take and the twentieth

[1] St. John 18:36.
[2] St. Luke 24:46.

soon supplied the world's greatest war and, if Christ tarry, is like to supply a worse war still.

The mere human instrument has broken in the hand of God: hence the necessity of Christ's intervention in the world's affairs, as the one hope of peace and right dealing.

"Christ will never impose His kingdom upon an unwilling world," is another peculiar idea, but that would mean abdication, a denial of His own prophecy of a powerful coming, and the contrary will be proved by the event. His Kingdom, which once came not with observation, as He walked humbly and in weakness among men, will be the observed of all observers, when men see Him come the second time.

"We know neither the day nor the hour," say those who keep silent on the coming. Quite true, but we do know the signs! Discerning the signs of the coming is a very different thing from fixing a date for it. Date-fixing is of doubtful wisdom, but discernment of the signs is a positive duty.

"He would only be crucified—or ignored—if He did come a second time," is an argument hardly needing reply, for the world will not a second time have Him in its power and at its mercy. His second coming will be, not as some

men imagine it might be, but powerfully and gloriously, as he has said it shall be. A pessimistic doctrine this used to be called, but now the time is changed and it is called too optimistic—yet the event completely justified that handful of optimists, Anna, Simeon and the rest, who, nineteen centuries ago, were waiting and looking for the consolation of Israel. Simeon saw in the temple the long-promised infant Messiah and he blessed God, saying: Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.[1]

A sudden, visible second advent is "a thought form" which is "not really compatible with modern knowledge" protests one clergyman, but the reason he gives is far from modern! He actually argues that "if Christ were to appear to-night in the clouds over England, the people in Australia would not see him, because Australia is beneath our feet." Extraordinary idea in these days, with television already a fact and only needing to be perfected to make the people of London visible in Australia! Sound and sight girdling the earth is a modern possibility which helps us to understand that Christ, as Lord of all the mar-

[1] St. Luke 2:25-32.

vellous powers of the universe, can, when He returns, make Himself visible by world-circling rays which will act direct upon the human eye.

One theory is that God would never choose to visit this small planet and its unimportant inhabitants. Rather strange that scepticism is sometimes so proud in its insistence that Man with a great big capital M, this wonderful being, is able to be his own god and master of his own fate, and at other times more 'umble than Uriah Heap in protesting that God would never stoop so low as to visit mere men on this so insignificant earth, an under-sized parvenu among countless vast heavenly bodies scattered over a mighty universe! Yet modern astronomical opinion is that this earth may be uniquely fitted for intelligent life. A central place in creation is from one point of view accorded to mankind by Professor Eddington, who says: "Spatially the scale of man is about midway between the atom and the star." The biggest stars known are but tracts of relative nothingness less dense than air, the mean density of Betelgeuse being not so much more than one-thousandth of the density of air! The sun, itself, though greatly larger than earth, is, as regards life and mind, a mere ministering servant of earth and of humanity. Does value go by size? Bethle-

hem was a very small place in a very small land, but there God was manifest in flesh as announced through the prophet thus: "out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Earth is God's small battlefield against sin, but, just as in human wars the fate of nations can be settled on very small battlefields, so, perhaps, the fate not only of this world, but of the universe, may be decided upon this small planetary battlefield. The truth about that we have yet to learn: in the meantime it suffices us to know that God the Son did and will again visit mankind and that, forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, thinking it "behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." [1] Yes, and that at His second coming, He might exercise judgment and rule over humankind, "because he is the Son of man." [2]

The revival of interest in prophecy is marked even among clergy and ministers who are not yet expecting an early advent. They admit that

[1] Hebrews 2:17. [2] St. John 5:27.

"various lines of Messianic prophecy met in the One Person of Christ," and one who is prominent among them goes to the length of saying that "the careful study of the relation of Old Testament prophecies in their relation to their fulfilment in the New Testament, may provide principles to guide us as we try to form some conception of the purpose which God has in store for the world." A step more and this writer would be in the ranks of the hopeful! For the grand principle disclosed by the study of prophecy fulfilled, is that God's supreme purposes for the world are accomplished through the personal interventions of His incarnate Son.

One baseless fear, silencing many, is that if Christ's coming is preached and the present crisis in human affairs abates, or even lasts a long time, and still He does not come, people may lose all faith. Not a bit of it, if preachers lay a true foundation in their hearers' minds by showing that Christ's coming is the appointed cure for the world's evils, chronic and acute, that every successive crisis is typical of the final one which will eventuate in His coming, and that even if the present crisis does not so eventuate, it does by its very extent and intensity surely point forward to the consummation of this age and the coming

of Christ. This preaching shows what God is aiming at. It safeguards people from the error of laying evil at the wrong door, the error of ascribing evil to God. Then, on such a foundation, we to-day, with the present signs and portents, can build the definite hope of Christ's imminent coming, for these signs and portents are now, so far as can be discerned, what He said they would be on the eve of His return. "But if not"—as Daniel's companions triumphantly said, when the testing of their faith began—we shall still know that in His own time He will come, and our present hope, even if postponed this time, will have been a wave carrying us nearer still to the shore of hope fulfilled, so that for us will glow, brighter than before, the assurance of the great day when Christ will come visibly to banish evil and make good supreme.

"The gospel of the cross is enough for me and I preach that," say some again. But is it enough for God? Is it enough even for the world to which you preach it? Is it good—it is *not* good—for the world to hear only of Him who suffered on earth for them, without hearing more about the fact that he will also come to reign? Multitudes have seen a film showing Christ in the humiliation of His first advent,—have wit-

nessed Him moving—pictured in betrayal, on trial, under scourging, hanging there, nailed, in His crucifixion agony. Millions have sat in the picture houses watching the tragedy of Him who loves them and gave Himself for them, in order that He might loose them from their sins in His own blood. Sitting in their plush seats, the modern populace of two hemispheres, like that other smaller crowd at Calvary, have lately seen—it has been reeled off for them afresh, time and time again—the spectacle of God the Son, becoming obedient to death, even the death of the cross! Is the picture finished? Is there no more for the world to see, nothing left on the reel?

"The End": is that enough to throw on the screen now? No! "Wherefore" . . . is the caption announcing the next phase: Wherefore God also hath highly exalted this humbled and crucified Jesus and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that to the glory of God the Father, Jesus Christ is Lord.[1] That exactly is what will happen when he comes again. God grant that this generation, which has viewed the mass representation, the world wide display of the Redeemer crucified, may

[1] Philippians 2:9, 10, 11.

see Him really come in the power and splendour of His reign!

Meanwhile, it is imperatively needful to foretell and picture by preaching "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."[1] Dread of His coming, rather than disbelief in it, makes part of the world unwilling to hear of it. This dread is due to a sense of unworthiness, for "who may abide the day of His coming? and who shall stand when He appeareth?"[2] Now here is the preacher's chance to show that Jesus Christ died on the cross to make amends for human sin. When mankind reckons up the immensity of its sin and all the fruits thereof, the need is clear for making of amends!

It has been badly broken, that twofold law of Christ: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy strength and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself—and the page of history is stained and blotted in consequence. All are involved, for all are chips of the same human block and each must know, as a British member of Parliament lately wrote, that "the sins of all mankind are upon his head," and must admit, too, that he cannot plead himself not guilty. That

[1] II Peter 1:16. [2] Malachi 3:2.

fundamental law declared by Christ had to be vindicated or its strength would be gone and only platitude remain—so it was vindicated at His expense, that God might be righteous in enforcing the law yet merciful to law-breaking humanity, mercy and justice meeting in the cross. An old-fashioned story, they say, but a fashion that comes in again when the Second Advent seems very near, and it is reassuring to reflect that the King who is coming is the Redeemer who came before. The fact of His will and power to return cannot be argued away: so timorous ones may well rejoice in the thought that if they owe God a debt, Christ has paid it, and if they have done God a wrong, Christ has atoned for it.

To calm public fear, and even panic, in face of war and rumour of war, and in danger of flood and earthquake, nothing will now avail but the Second Advent message. Formerly, the messengers thereof were charged with engendering fear; but in these troublous times the fear exists already, and it is their privilege to cure it, by pointing forward to the immutable purpose of God to bring violent nature and violent nations into peaceful obedience to Christ; by pointing upward to the heavens which one day will open to disclose the returning Prince of Peace.

"Why not," murmur the critics, "preach trust in a sane, concerted attempt to bring the ship of human society through the storm." But earthquake and tornado are hardly amenable to any preventive human effort. As for war, the concerted human efforts made since the great war, and long before it, have not finally assured peace between nations, not, indeed, within nations, for civil war has increased. An alternative and better hope is thus needed as protection against doubt and despair and, pending its glorious fulfilment, those who are trying to steer the ship of human society safely amid shoals and icebergs will find none so unobstructive, so uncontentious, so sympathetic, as believers in the return of Christ.

The more numerous in any nation are those who are looking for Christ's coming, the easier will be the human steersman's task until He come. What a different world this would already be, if it were now joyfully looking forward to the return of its divine King—what effect that loyal, welcoming expectancy might have in making strife seem wrong and the lust for dominance futile, since dominance must be surrendered at His coming to Him whose right it is!

And has not Britain's prime minister said that in the struggle that goes on in this world in un-

light or fog, men blindly hitting in the mêlée those who should be their friends and brothers, he, for one, could not work unless for a faith and hope that some day, however near or far off, the Kingdom of God will overspread the earth. A clear case for Church, sovereigns, presidents, and statesmen, as well as for men and women of every degree, to preach as the hope of the world the personal coming of the divine King and His kingdom!

Now, in their turn, let clergy and ministers who differ tell us what is their hope of a better world. The Master himself, in so many words, has said that the true hope is His own return in person, and the facts of nigh two thousand years of history confirm this literal interpretation of His promise and prophecy. No alternative hope of a peaceful and righteous world can be found in the Bible: Have you found one elsewhere, and if so, what is it? We listen. Do you say ev—— that blessed word again! It will not do: After millions of years that have brought us no further than this we cannot trust merely to a dilatory, too able, impersonal force or process. From its delays and accidents may Christ soon deliver this world by His coming again!

CHAPTER X

The Celestial Invasion of Earth

AN EARTHLY invasion of the skies! Men are now aiming at this—just when God is preparing the Celestial Invasion of earth.

Strange, and more than strange, as we shall see, is this coincidence! For if men can hope to invade the skies, so much the more can Jesus Christ divinely, personally, visibly invade the earth!

"The first step towards the navigation of cosmic space has been realised," came the message from Germany in April 1928, with hope expressed that before the year's end a machine driven on the "rocket" principle might be sent "beyond the bounds of the terrestrial atmosphere." Hardly has man done the once impossible and conquered the air, than he aims at the next impossible, the conquest of outer space. The ambition is not new nor even the plan for realising it, for a report of the trial of the Opel machine reminded us[1]: "It is a remarkable tribute

[1] *Morning Post* correspondent in Berlin.

to the prescience of Newton that he enunciated, as the only possible way of reaching the stars, a rocket system on the very lines now carried into practical realisation by Opel." Although the early Opel experiments like other experiments in new forms of locomotion by land, sea and air have been attended by mishaps, the hope of invading the skies and visiting the planets remains.

The space ship! The navigation of cosmic space! These terms are, we are told, on the way to join, in common parlance, automobile, aeroplane, radiophone, televisor. Inventors, once they begin exploring space, will not stop at anything to accomplish their aim, and perhaps there is some truth in the notion that any invention which the human mind is able to conceive can sooner or later be realised in practice. Jules Verne with his voyage to the moon, as with his imaginary submarine, was but finger-pointing the way for practical inventors to follow.

So earth-man's invasion of the skies is to be the next scientific marvel. Wonders will never cease. Are there other planets peopled as our own is peopled? If there are fellow creatures of ours, living here and there amid the starry universe, we want to know them, signal to them, speak to them, even visit them. So the word goes. "If on other

worlds there is life, and above all, that superior form of life which is thought, we cannot resign ourselves to remain everlastingly separated from these brothers of the stars who stretch out their arms to us across space," says M. L. Houllevigue, the author of *Interastral Communication,* in an article in the Science section of the *Revue de Paris.* He recalls the project of a Russian scientist, and the design of the American professor, Robert H. Goddard, which enlisted the benevolent interest of the Smithsonian Institution, for a space-travelling rocket apparatus, and the calculations of the well-known French engineer, M. Esnault-Pelterie, touching the problem of interastral communication. Before the Astronomical Society of France, M. Esnault-Pelterie gave in June 1927 a remarkable lecture on the exploration by rockets of the upper atmosphere and the possibility of interplanetary voyages. Since then, he and M. André Hirsch have offered an annual prize to encourage the preparation of great interastral expeditions which, remarks M. Houllevigue, "will liberate the man of to-morrow, or the day after, from bondage to his minute planet." He concurs with the "just remark" of M. Esnault-Pelterie, that "once the terrestrial zone of attraction has been passed, it will be hardly more

difficult to attain the confines of our universe, than to make a neighbourly promenade within the solar system: it is a matter of time and speed"; adding, "also the duration of the voyage would have not to exceed that of a human life; but even so, do not the mechanics of Einstein take into account such an avatar, whence the travellers, thanks to the relativity of time, would return rejuvenated."

Awaiting the feasibility of voyages in space, of material links between our earth and the rest of the universe, M. Houllevigue advised an immediate attempt at astro-communication by light signals. An astrophare, sending out luminous beams, say, in the direction of Mars to begin with, would in his view be within the present resources of science and worthy to be tried, even if the navigation of space must be for a later day.

But, already, have come the German experiment and expectation of an early first entry into outer space. How wonderfully the practicability of Christ's return to earth is illustrated by the experimental efforts of mere humanity to sail up and out into the skies!

A very prominent scientist and philosopher has just written deliberately: "I do not think that the idea of travelling to other planets should be ruled

out as an impossibility." All the more, then, is it possible for Christ to visit earth!

One English bishop preaches as an extra-evangel that there are, perhaps, unknown planets, perchance populated! His notion is that it is at least possible that in our island universe—to say nothing of others—there are numerous planets where beings exist vastly superior in intellectual power and spiritual understanding to ourselves. To know these more developed planets and their vastly superior inhabitants is presumably desired!

As a trial trip we will make for the moon first, cry bold inventors. Sooner or later man will set foot on the moon, says the French engineer above cited, and adds:

"I do not know that it is any more fantastic now to talk about going to the moon in a rocket, than it was fifty years ago to discuss flying three hundred miles an hour in an airplane."

A store of oxygen within the hermetically sealed rocket car could supply the travellers' needs, he reckons, and orientation would not present a difficulty. The return journey, once started, would be simpler yet, because of the stronger gravitational pull of earth.

This plan of visiting the moon, leading on to visits to the planets, brings to mind André

Maurois's imaginary account of war with the moon, ending with the words, "Thus began the era of interplanetary war."

Knowing our neighbours on the planets is an interesting idea—but suppose they are bad neighbours. We may toy with the fancy of visiting them, but suppose they should visit us, and with hostile intent! Messengers from Mars—is the name portentous?—might be martially-minded. Men dream of travelling through space: what if other beings on other planets are already doing it? These "vastly superior beings," according to the bishop's hypothesis, have "learned to produce energy by annihilating matter, and to them our wireless is a commonplace of an almost forgotten past." Voyaging from planet to planet might be well within their present powers! Modern progress has made war worldwide, it may yet, on the above showing, make war interplanetary—make war universal!

No escape, then, from the necessity of the personal control by God of all created intelligences! Christ, Prince of Peace, remains the only hope. And let it not be said that men and women are more curious, more desirous to see possibly-existent planetary fellow creatures than

they are to see their great God and Saviour, the returning Jesus Christ! . . .

A celestial invader—that is what Jesus becomes, according to such doctrine, complains one writer, but our exultant reply is that the Celestial Invader and His celestial invasion are exactly what this old world needs! His first celestial invasion Jesus has already made. Once before, "through the tender mercy of our God . . . the dayspring from on high hath visited us." [1] The dawn-light in darkness Christ then gave has maintained its promise ever since. What will it be when, at His next invasion, he shines upon the world, "as the sun shineth in his strength!"

One thing is clearly proved by ambitious human efforts to invade space, and that is the credibility of the predicted resistance by Christ's earthly enemies to his return. War between men in the air was already a fact in the last war. The next war, many think, will be fought principally in the air, cities and their inhabitants being bombed from above, to ruins and to death. Sources of superpotent energy are sought. New rays, "death rays," are rumoured as future means of war. Modern science aspires to mastery of universal force, as well as of universal space.

[1] St. Luke 1:78.

To disturb the upper atmosphere, barring entry from without, would not be beyond the dreams of science. And considering that the discoveries of the scientists are already exploited, abused, by humanity in warring against humanity, why should it be thought a thing impossible that rebellious human elements should exploit and abuse scientific discoveries in warring against their returning King and God?

Mysterious and awe-inspiring is the present trend of human thoughts and deeds in the direction shown by prophecy!

> "Why do the nations rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." [1]

First to fulfil this prophecy, was Herod, jealous of the rightful king, sending armed men to kill Him. Forewarned, may the rulers of the modern world, like Nineveh of old, blessedly falsify prediction by choosing walking in the right path! . . .

[1] Psalm 2:1-3.

From all over the world, the King of kings will be heard and seen. Nowadays we should expect that! Even ordinary kings can speak round the world, thanks to wireless waves and the Heaviside layer causing these to follow the curvature of the earth. Television has come. "Distance no Barrier to Television" headed the news of Baird's transatlantic experiment.

What a fresh vindication of the Bible is provided by television! A comparison of the following passages is indeed instructive.

"And the devil, taking him [Jesus] up into an high mountain, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time."

St. Luke 4:5.

"Some scientists of brilliant repute believe with Baird that television in the next few decades will make the whole world visible to any person in any part of it. We shall not merely talk of Ottawa, Cape Town, Calcutta, Melbourne, and so forth; we shall not merely talk of New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago,

San Francisco, and the rest; we shall not merely talk of Moscow and Peking or Hankow.

"From this island we shall see them. We shall see persons and scenes thousands and thousands of miles away. Without stirring we shall travel the globe certain years hence when the whole world is seen in the magic mirror of television."

J. L. Garvin,
in the *Observer*.

Thus we find the Bible to be nineteen centuries ahead of science.

Scientists in old and new worlds seemed very modern when they first thought of worldwide vision, but the Bible was before them! The King of England and the President of the United States are to be visible to every eye the wide world over,

but the Bible long ago predicted that the King of kings will be so. Loud speaker experiments in early 1928 made human voices heard by the unaided human ear within a radius of twenty miles, and Marconi soon after predicted that the human voice would be heard from Dover to Calais. Suppose the voice made transmissible further still; suppose an analogous extension of sight! If science can do so much, assuredly the King of kings, with His infinite resources, can make Himself heard and seen by the ears and eyes of all men in every corner of the earth.

Incarnate still, "the same Jesus"[1] will be as really visible at His coming as when human eyes saw him before. The Incarnation is not a baffling mystery—for if God, as Creator, can incarnate us His creatures, He can surely and much more easily incarnate Himself! The modern recognition of matter as the visible expression of invisible energy requires us to believe that the Word of God could and did become materially manifest in flesh. The Resurrection is, for the same reason, less mysterious than it used to be, and we are not impressed by the doubter's complaint that "the natural process of dissolution would have to be inverted." Because the creative energy that ani-

[1] Acts 1:11.

mates a body can re-animate it and can equally transfigure and glorify that same body, as has happened with the body of the Lord Jesus Christ. Even resurrection, after bodily disintegration, is not beyond scientific comprehension, because the Power that has integrated a human body can re-integrate it—the sequence being integration, disintegration, reintegration and the identity of the body being in the third phase what it was in the first. In fact, the case from birth to death is not so very different, because the constituent material of the body is ever being replaced, and, as the saying goes, is entirely renewed each seven years. Yet the body is reckoned the same body, and it houses the same occupant.

The Ascension does not perplex this generation, because, having discovered so many new, unsuspected secrets of nature, it is intellectually incapable of denying that the Son of God, through some energy, divinely available, could make his ascension. How could a generation that has contradicted the impossible of its forebears and learnt to fly, and that now prepares to voyage in outer space, pretend that Jesus could not quit earth and regain heaven! . . .

Even as an uncrowned and rejected King, He had his little court of disciples. Through the cen-

turies this court has grown, and the prediction is that the whole faithful band of them will be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air," thereafter to return with Him as attendants and witnesses of His majestic appearing to the world: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." What a mystery this used to be—that earthbound beings should rise into the air! Is it not, however, a still greater puzzle that men or beasts are not hurled into, or do not float vaguely in space, but are kept on earth by the earth's mysterious pull upon them? Gravitation, wrote the schoolboy, *"is what prevents an apple going to heaven."* However mistaken he may be as to the destination of a non-gravitated *apple,* he has certainly elucidated the question of the ascension of Christ's host of disciples. For although gravitation now holds them to earth, a stronger counter-attraction, the summoning power of their Lord, will overcome the earth pull, so that they will ascend. Thus ascends the steel to meet the magnet! In this day that has brought human flying in heavier-than-air machines, the conquest of the air by artificial means of human invention, we grasp the fact that, without any such artificial aid, the Church of Christ can and will ascend to meet Him in the air.

If a human scientist's pen can write that "gravitation is a bipolar force akin to magnetism and electrically controllable with ease," it is even more scientifically reasonable for the Apostle to write: "We shall be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air." If men can meet each other in the air, for battle and slaughter, all the more can Christ and His followers meet in the air, in holy convocation, preparatory to His coming with them to earth in His reign as Prince of Peace. . . .

To speak of "up from" and "down to" the earth is not unscientific, for scientists do so speak. An astronomer [1] will say that the supposed cosmic radiation "comes downwards." An aeroplane, every one says, goes up and comes down again. When a rocket-car visits some planet it will go up, as truly as a ship goes out of the harbour, and then, like a ship through the watery ocean, will make tracks through the ocean of space toward its goal.

"Heaven is not a place but a state," object some, who do not, however, clearly explain what they mean. Well, let heaven be both—a state and a place! Heaven must be a place, and for this reason, that localisation is a principle of the con-

[1] Professor Eddington in *The Internal Constitution of the Stars.*

struction of the universe. The sun, moon, stars, and all the planets are localised. Here on earth, localisation is the rule. Events, even, we are to consider as located in space—"events are located not in one place, *still less in no place at all,* but in the place where they will occur." In a word, if earth is a place, much more is heaven a place! Earth is less, not more, a place than heaven. Earth is rather the copy and shadow, however spoiled, of the place called heaven, just as the earthly tabernacle was made according to the original heavenly pattern, "for, see, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." [1]

Similarly, the personality of God is more surely a fact than is the personality of man, which is but a reflection, distorted at that, of the personality of his creator. Man's chief pride is his personality. Say of any one that he has no personality, and you dub him a nonentity. Personality, on the other hand, connotes not only individuality, but largeness of character and intellect. The grander a human personality, the more he transcends the limitations of the average man or woman. God is personality carried to the highest power. Those great eminent Victorians,

[1] Hebrews 8:5.

who specialised in the denial of the personality of God, plumed themselves exceedingly upon their own personality, which they evidently considered their greatest asset, and one has only to read the biographies and memoirs of the period to be struck by the characteristic and pronounced, if harmless, exploitation by those Victorian worthies of their own personality. However, the day approaches when the personality of God will be a visible, and therefore proven, fact of universal knowledge.

Astronomers, do you say, have never discovered this place called heaven? But astronomy has its limits. If there are planets anywhere but in the solar system, astronomy does not know it. Astronomer Eddington declares that even "the largest luminous bodies in the universe may be invisible," even to astronomers, because a luminous star of more than a certain density and diameter, "would not, in consequence of its attraction, allow any of its rays to arrive at us." Furthermore, there exist in space patches of light-absorbing material which hide the astronomers' view of all that may be behind. For these and other reasons, possibly still unknown, astronomy cannot disprove the existence of the place called heaven. . . .

"The Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven"—this is quite accordant with modern science, for already we know of matter travelling, through space, earthward. Sir Ernest Rutherford,[1] some time since, pointed out that "E. A. Milne has shown how certain atoms of matter, ejected from the sun, notably those of calcium, may, in consequence of absorption and emission of radiation, acquire sufficiently high velocities to penetrate deeply into our atmosphere." But matter, indeed, fills the whole of space, argues Professor Eddington, who thinks there can be no doubt of "the fulness of interstellar space" and "the existence of a cosmic cloud pervading the stellar system" . . . and adds that "the system of the stars is floating in an ocean that is so far material that one atom or thereabouts occurs in every cubic inch."[2] Well, if matter can pervade, and if matter can traverse, space, so much more can the incarnate Lord of matter travel from heaven to earth.

From what distance, with what speed His coming will be, science cannot tell. We do know that even we humans can move amazingly faster than

[1] In a Presidential address to the Royal Society.
[2] *Stars and Atoms.*

of old. A little over a century ago, horse was our quickest means of locomotion. Train-speed amazed our ancestors, even at twenty-five miles an hour. The great flight-speeds of to-day, reckoned in hundreds of miles hourly, and still more the audacious ambition to reach even a thousand miles an hour speed, would have staggered them had they prophetically known it all. What possible limit could be set to the speed of the Creator's own earthward journey!

Then what is this idea of electrons changing from one orbit to another without traversing the space in between? Scientists who can conceive such mysterious happenings in creation, can hardly deny that the Creator is able still more wonderfully to master space. Light, they hypothesise, travels at the maximum possible speed and (though daring speculators question as to possible instantaneity) nothing does, nothing can travel faster. Nothing created, perhaps, but what of the Creator? Light's speed, however great, is only *relative!* Absolute speed, infinite velocity, instantaneity, in a word, must be that of the Creator.

To assign an infinite velocity even to light is one proposition of to-day discussed in *The Logic*

of Modern Physics,[1] whose author, after arguing the point, says:

> "We have seen that it is possible to define velocity in terms of operations different from the usual one in such a way as . . . to give an infinite velocity to light."

Of solar and stellar distances, the same writer affirms that we cannot surely measure them, because, "here space is entirely optical in character" and

> "No direct measures of length have ever been made, nor can we even measure the three angles of a triangle and so check our assumption that the use of Euclidian geometry in extending the concept of space is justified. We have never under observation more than two angles of a triangle, as when we measure the distance of the moon by observation from the ends of the earth's diameter. To extend to still greater distances our measures of length, we have to make still further assumptions. . . . Astronomy is usually regarded as a science of extraordinarily high accuracy, but its ac-

[1] Professor P. W. Bridgman.

> curacy is very restricted in character, namely to the measurement of angles. . . . At greater and greater distances . . . the very nature of the operations by which length is to be determined becomes indefinite. . . .
>
> "In the extension from terrestrial to great stellar distances, the concept of length has changed completely in character. To say that a certain star is 105 light years distant is actually and conceptually an entirely different *kind* of thing from saying that a certain goal post is 100 meters different."

Modern science plainly will not, and if it would, could not contradict revelation and its promise of the material and visible return of Christ. The "laws of nature" cannot be invoked against His material visible return, if only because no one pretends any longer to know what all the laws of nature are. "New kinds of experience are always possible," says the writer just cited, and when experiment or experience is pushed into new domains "we must be prepared for new facts of an entirely different character from those of our former experience, and it is difficult to conceive anything more scientifically bigoted than to postulate that all possible experience conforms to the

same type as that with which we are already familiar."

Laws of nature, so called, are nothing but the scientists' generalisations based upon their observation. Only a few thousand years back, at most, does recorded human observation of nature extend, and modern scientific observation, aided by modern instruments, is very, very recent, indeed! Absurd, preposterous to deny the possibility of Christ's material, visible return on such scant, short-lasting observation as that! Science is not qualified to say no to any prophecy of the future doings of God.

Science, however, can and does cast its sidelights on the wonders recorded in the Bible. Vision in darkness, vision through opaque solids, involving the invisibility of such solids (a Russian savant, Vassilief, is even reported to claim that he can make inanimate bodies of men and animals transparent and invisible, and hopes to do as much with living ones) such scientific achievements and aims remind us that if so much is, or may be, possible to men, much more is possible to God. Ready enough is science, nowadays, to hail any possible or supposed "event without precedent" as in the supposed case of the star "Nova Pictoris."

Modern ideas about time help to explain the feasibility of prophecy, because they deem the future already existent. In space-time, conceived as four-dimensional space, "past, present and future are all there together,"[1] is one expression of this idea. Another is:

> "No time ever comes before or after another: each exists within its own limits and cannot be qualified or determined as 'past' or 'future' by another, any more than an extended thing is really 'right' or 'left' in space."

The distinction between past, present, and future exists in our mind, but does not exist in the mind of God! "The super-temporal agent is capable of contemplating the future, as well as of grasping the past."[2] All is *now* for God. Even we are master of two tenses, remembering, as we do, the past while living in the present. God remembers the future also, seeing and foretelling, as He does, the end from the beginning. "I have even from the beginning declared it to thee; before it came to pass I shewed it thee."[3] For an infinite mind, admitted Henri Poincaré, past,

[1] *Relativity and Gravitation,* T. Percy Munn.
[2] Professor Lasky in *Journal of Philosophical Studies.*
[3] Isaiah 48:5.

present, and future would be equally present, equally known. God has that infinite mind: for Him there is one all-inclusive present tense. Jesus, in terms perfectly scientific, affirmed His deity by saying: "Before Abraham was, I am." That He had divine knowledge of the future, even in those days of His veiled glory, He showed by prophesying the remarkable things which are now actually coming to pass. . . .

Take a pedestrian who cannot see the town at his journey's end until he gets there, and compare his case with that of an aviator making for the same town. The aviator may see this, the end of the journey, from the beginning—because the aviator, being lifted up on high, has a different viewpoint from that of the man walking on the level. So may we illustrate the why and wherefore of God's power of prophecy. God, divine Observer, sees "past and future mapped out" before Him, and that which He sees is written in prophecy. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."[1]

[1] Amos 3:7.

CHAPTER XI

The Panorama of Coming Events

THINGS distant we see through a telescope, things minute through a microscope, and future things we see through Prophecy, which is a proscope, a prognostoscope, a futuroscope, if one might coin such word.

The grand panorama of things-to-be is spread before us in prophecy. What do we see there? It is a complex picture. Putting our right eye, as it were, to the prognostoscope we see a great stirring and much movement; a travelling hither and thither, "many shall run to and fro"; a making of many discoveries, "knowledge shall be increased"; rapidly changing rules and customs; a rejecting of once accepted authority; an intense and phenomenal love of pleasure, intermingled with anxiety and even dread; unrest and transition in political government, trending to dictatorship; religious ferment, some holding or reverting to the faith of centuries and others departing from it, humanism, religious and political, culminating in the apotheosis of a man whom many

follow, instead of looking for the true Christ to come. Eye still at the prognostoscope, we see outbreaks of nature, storms, lightning flashes, raging sea and towering waves, earthquakes here, there, in divers places; and amid these explosions of nature we see many, many sick and hungry people, even while elsewhere on the earth others are feasting and revelling; we see war and threatening clouds of war.

As we look intently, we notice that two most remarkable, outstanding things are happening. The first is that a country, Palestine, is coming back to life; from many lands a little stream of folk makes its way thither; homes spring into being; the earth is turning green; Jerusalem the down-trodden begins to lift its head; the ancient promise for this land seems budding again to fulfilment.

The other of these two remarkable developments is also a revival of the past—it is the return, in the modern world, of the Roman imperial entity, the refederation of the same nations that composed the ancient Roman Empire. Through the prognostoscope of prophecy this has long been visible, though it is only to-day being accomplished. Even when every fact of world politics still seemed dead against such possibili-

ties, students of prophecy knew, and publicly said, that Palestine would be reopened to the Jew and that the Roman Empire would come back in modern dress. A trusty and marvellous scientific instrument is this prognostoscope, this Biblical prophecy!

Look through it again, look again at the vivid pre-picture it shows of the modern world. In this throbbing, tumultuous scene, one wants to find some guiding lines, to gain some clear understanding of its purport. Like a disturbed ant-hill in a thunderstorm it might seem, at first sight, but as the eye remains fixed at the instrument, taking time to consider the scene, it observes that certain dominant lines stand out and give meaning to the whole. Two strongly-marked horizontal lines or paths are seen to converge amid a thickening tangle of stressful events and conditions, and at the point of their convergence and the thickest of the tangle, these two lines are met by a third line, descending vertically from above. The first two lines mark, as we know, the course of Gentile and of Jewish history, respectively, as foretold by the Lord Himself when He said: "Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." The tangle of shadow about them, as they converge, is

the multiple unrest of these times. The line coming downward to meet the other two, as they converge at the liberating of Jerusalem and the conclusion of this present age, properly called the times of the Gentiles—what is that? Gazing through the prognostoscope, we see the line as it is traced, lightning-like downward; we see the tangle and shadow dispelled; we see the Son of man coming from above, earthward, in His power and his great glory; we see the climax of history; we witness that great divine event, not now far off, toward which all history and the whole creation move.

This cataclysmic view of history is not to everybody's fancy, but as against fancy, truth has the right of way. The Gordian knot of history will not be gradually untied; it will, and can only, be suddenly cut.

Past experience shows the cataclysmic factor in history. An eminent modern historian, Sir Charles Oman,[1] discusses this very point saying:

> "Two generations have passed since the blessed word evolution was invented and applied, as a universal panacea, to all the problems of the Universe—historical no less than physical or metaphysical. By this I mean

[1] Member of Parliament for Oxford University.

> that a whole school of historians set forth the thesis that all history is an ordered movement of development or decadence, a series of inevitable results following on well marshalled tables of causes. . . . They wanted to turn history into a continuous and mechanical panorama of evolution or devolution. . . ."

In contradistinction to this view Sir Charles Oman says: "Now I hold, myself, that history is quite as much cataclysmic as evolutionary." History, he pursues, is not a mere logical stream of events, but a series of happenings "affected in the most inscrutable fashion by incalculable things." Natural phenomena, war, and the appearance of outstanding personalities he reckons among the "great cataclysms that break up the annals of the world into separate epochs." Exactly so does the Bible represent the flow of history and its cataclysmic division into separate epochs.

We have just seen through the prognostoscope the foreview of the end of this present epoch, the Times of the Gentiles. We saw the interaction of natural phenomena, social upheaval, warfare, dictatorial activity, and especially the activity of a super-dictator, and, finally, the sudden, mighty

coming of that most epoch-making of all personages, the Son of God.

The cataclysmic crisis of the Age-end has in past history been preceded and typified by many crises of minor extent and degree. History witnesses also that the personal factor is decisively important, though, in the case of mere supermen, not always for good. The fashion of decrying the "influence of individuals in the long tale of centuries" and their part in determining and "deflecting the course of history," Sir Charles Oman attributes partly to "the old egalitarian dislike of figures that seem too great to fit into the frame of everyday life." Owing to this equalitarianism, the outstanding personality is "whittled down" that it may not "offend the susceptibilities of smaller men, and sin against the great doctrine of equality." More or less, that describes some folks' dealing with the Lord Jesus Christ. He made Himself out to be God as well as man: they make Him out to be—though different in degree —yet entirely the same in kind as other men. They call Him good, but not God: He told them that only God is truly good so that He, Jesus, being good, must be God, and in seeing Him men do really see God. . . .

The appearance of an Alexander the Great, of

some individual human being of unusual endowments, has been the most frequent cause of great historical change, thinks Sir Charles Oman, who holds that "Carlyle was not so very far wrong in his general theory that the decisive marks in the annals of the world are the 'Heroes,' as he called them, outstanding figures of men who left their impress on their own time and often on the future also."

The trouble about these heroes, or supermen, is that they are mortal and even ultra-mortal, as the fate of Caesar shows. They are menaced, if not by the resentment of the masses whose favour they may perhaps secure, then by the egalitarian enmity of the not-quite-supermen.

The rule of one superman is by far the most efficient rule, but even supermen are only human, to however high a power their humanity be raised—and being human, it is theirs to err. And error in the modern world is more dangerous and far-spreading than ever it could be of old, just as difficulties are more numerous and complex. Bring back, if that could be, the greatest statesmen of the past and they could not master the problems of these days, as they mastered the problems of their own. What heart or mind, even of superman, can comprehend the needs of

the modern world, the rights and wrongs of all the issues of its life, and frame the suited policy: what will of superman would be equal to putting that policy in motion: what power except God's own power could ever get the right world policy fulfilled! Limited situations have, for a certain time, and more or less, been now and then saved by exceptional human beings, though such cases can be matched by misfortunes brought upon nations by other individuals, equally exceptional and less useful. But the very best that a superman could do is not complete and lasting, as the Kingdom of God must be and will be when the divine King returns. . . .

If, in world crises, supermen are not enough, average men are not enough either. The moral of all the memoirs of the Great War is simply that—the inability of average men to rise to the full height of statesmanship in a world crisis. Divided opinions—that is the first trouble! In national danger, members of war cabinets, even more than members of cabinets in time of peace, disagree about what to do and how to do it: the result is inaction, or half-action, or two or more inconsistent actions. Such conflict of views, though disastrous, may not be blameworthy, but it shows the inadequacy of any group

of average men for statesmanship in a world whose complexity is ever increasing.

The War Diary of Lord Oxford and Asquith, coming on top of other candid confidences of war chiefs, political and military, moved the London *Daily Telegraph* to these just remarks respecting the leaders of all the nations concerned in the war of 1914-18:

> "The great war was of such a magnitude from the very start as to be as much beyond the compass of the statesmen who were in nominal control of policy as of the generals who were in command of the armies in the field. The machine was beyond their minding when once it was fairly on the move. That was suspected at the time; all the revelations which have since been made confirm it, Lord Oxford's with the rest."

Far more beyond human compass are the issues of to-day and to-morrow than were even those of the late war.

The disclosures not only of divided counsels, but of the conflict of ambitions among war-time leaders, show plainly that mere human beings are not sufficient for governing the world which must be ruled by Him who for love of humankind put

off supreme glory, went down from the highest place and, making Himself of no reputation, subjected Himself to human scorn and to a felon's death. This One, only, can we trust to rule. For his kingdom was won, not through ambition but renunciation, not by self-assertion but by self-abnegation upon the cross—because, as the old prophet foretold it, He hath poured out His soul unto death and He was numbered with the transgressors and He bare the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors. Only this One truly deserves our vote and voice, as we pray him to come back and reign!

Meantime, let those of us who are not in statesmen's shoes avoid the self-conceit of thinking ourselves superior to those who are or have been statesmen, and of boasting that we should not have acted as did those who, in various lands, strove for pre-eminence while the enemy was at the national gate, or let feelings of rivalry and *amour propre* count for more than public welfare. Average men in an average station naturally appear to better advantage than when they sit in the seats of the mighty: and if we who are tempted to criticise the statesmanship, or lack thereof, shown by our average brethren, reflect but a moment, we shall see that we, as average folk ourselves,

cannot warrant that we should do other than they have done. And of course women, as such, will be the same (though not one bit worse) as the men, now that the doors of governmental office are opening wide to them, for they, too, are simply human beings.

The fatal flaw in the party political system is its favourite rule, that the business of the opposition is to oppose. The assumption of the human politician that he is white and right and the saviour of society, and his opponent blackly wrong and the nation's very perdition, may be held a necessity of the game, or of the times, but O! for the Kingdom of God when the divine Statesman, wholly knowing and wholly able, will wholly do that which is right!

The tragi-comedy of this present human governance is that the wisest, loyalest acts of a leader are quite commonly the very ones that cost him all his favour with his followers, as well as his public popularity and his power to serve. Hence he is sorely tempted to take short views, make hand-to-mouth moves, watch how the cat jumps and jump with it; to court popularity by well-sounding words, rather than risk losing it by acts, however good. Jesus himself, the divine Statesman, has found more to praise him for what

he said, than to prize him for who and what he *is;* and more to applaud his words, true and wonderful as they are, than to be grateful for his sublime deed of the cross—he has found more, we might add, to cherish him as a memory of the past than to worship him as God eternal of the divine, endless present and to welcome him as the coming King. . . .

The world cannot go on as it is! That is the general feeling to-day. Some one hand must seize the steering wheel, is a very prevalent idea. Dictatorship is already installed in many lands—either of one, as in Italy and Spain, or, as in Russia, of a group with one man dominant in that group.

Admit, you sceptics, that you did not foresee this dictatorial development among the nations, when already students of prophecy did—because they saw it in the mirror of prophecy. This reflection of the future permitted them to know that as the Age draws to its close, a super-dictator will obtain a predominant place in the world, and they have understood and said that he will be at the apex of a system of associated dictatorships—this being the last human experiment in government before the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ

to establish the divine order of government in the world.

A symptom—this coming in of dictatorship! It means that the world is looking for a head, democracy proving too much like a body that is headless. The world needs a chief, and the "Chiefest among ten thousand" will answer the need; the world wants a prince, and the Prince of the rulers of the earth will soon be here; the world is in disorder for lack of the King of kings, and He is coming. Instinctively, humankind is preparing in various ways for a day when the world will be drawn together as one, under this one divine control. But without that control, mere speed and ease of communication and the assembling in conference and the framing of pacts will not give union and harmony. Likewise, one-man rule cannot realise the hope that many, weary of democratic shortcomings, may found upon it—unless it be the rule of the Son of man, himself.

The modern spread of dictatorship throughout many lands is, then, a sign of the times. Even in Great Britain and the United States, the two strongholds of democratic rule, democracy is not venerated as formerly. Dissatisfaction with each and every possible form of human government is rife, even in the English-speaking world to-day.

In all systems of government, it is a mere chance whether the individual called to the direction of affairs will be qualified for the undertaking, murmured Maine [1] many years ago, with the further complaint of democracy that "while it gives birth to despotism with the greatest facility, it does not seem capable of producing aristocracy," although in his day, as he said, "some of the keenest observers of democracy" did "not share this opinion" but seemed to be persuaded that the "combined movements towards scientific perfection and towards democracy, would result in government by an aristocracy of brains"—of which prospect Maine pessimistically remarked:

> "I may be permitted to doubt whether mankind would derive unmixed advantage from putting in the place of the older privileged orders an ascetic aristocracy of men of science, with intellects perfected by unremitting exercise, absolutely confident in themselves and absolutely sure of their conclusions."

However, this wild dream was not realised, for men of science, sticking to their last, have eschewed the halls of State, and far from being absolutely sure of their political conclusions, are now

[1] *Ancient Law.*

modestly unsure even of their scientific conclusions. The democratic idea remains imperfectly realised in practice, and while in many countries the pendulum has fully swung to dictatorship, we have seen in the emergency of war time, even within the fortresses of democracy the setting up of quasi-dictatorship, and the same will happen again in any season of real peril. Furthermore, if an international body, effectual to assure world peace for a time, were mainly composed of dictatorially ruled nations, it would not be that fact which would deter other and democratically ruled nations from joining it. Thus a world mainly under dictatorship, long since anticipated by students of prophecy, is a very imminent practical possibility. The whole Latin world, not excepting France, even, is very tolerant of one-man chieftaincy: all Eastern peoples, despite some experiments in Western democracy, readily accept it: the Slavs of Russia are dictatorially governed as it is, whether by one, or by one plus a few others, is perhaps immaterial to them. A confederacy of dictatorially governed states would irresistibly come under the direction of one pre-eminent chief.

Thus the lineaments of ancient prophecy are being, bit by bit, reproduced in modern world do-

ings. Prophecy even supplies warning lest the human makeshifts and temporary expedients of the closing phase of the age be mistaken for something sound and lasting, lest instead of simply occuying until He come, the powers-that-be should turn usurper and falsely claim to remain in occupation in Christ's stead. . . .

No escape from the reasoned conclusion that prophecy is true—and is coming true before our eyes, in this our day! Yes, the prognostoscope is eyes to the blind—enabling humanity, sightless save for yesterday and to-day, to see the morrow. Merciful prognostoscope—setting us free from humiliating ignorance of the future!

Sign by sign, we will now proceed with our study of the evidence that the great change is near!

CHAPTER XII

Signs of The Times: Upheavals of Nature

NATURE'S violence in these latter days is no surprise to those guided by prophecy. Ever since 1917, thousands of us have known that many earthquakes and great storms were imminent. As the chord waked by the conductor's beat, the Balfour Declaration on Palestine and the Jews decisively opened the last movement of the strange symphony of this Age. The other signs were bound to follow, and nature's stressful notes were certain to be heard, as the final phase of the Age, analogous by its unrest and cacophony to some modernist music, hastens to its close.

Nature's disturbance has gone crescendo, especially since the end of 1925. "Great upheavals and shocks of Nature have characterised 1926," was the verdict of one London newspaper, but the next year was to see still more and greater shocks and upheavals. Floods were one scourge of 1927—the Mississippi floods, floods in New England, in European lands, floods in China.

Hurricane, typhoon, and tornado raged in 1927, especially in Florida, the Bermudas, Japan, while even the British Isles, usually spared such ordeals, experienced hurricane weather, especially in Glasgow and Lancashire.

"Great earthquakes will there be in divers places"—this sign of the age-end increased remarkably in 1927. Earthquakes occurred in Persia, in India, in America, in Crimea, in Crete, Italy, Portugal, Switzerland, in France, in Southern Germany, in California, in Australia, in China, with 100,000 deaths and great towns overwhelmed, in Siberia, in Alaska, in Palestine, and in the British Isles. So rarely are British earthquakes felt, that the perceptible shaking of twenty counties and the Channel Isles was significant. A member of Parliament pointed out that "it was not a severe quake, but for this country quite unusual."

Most portentous of all was the Palestine earthquake. Among the buildings affected was the Mosque of Omar on the ancient Temple site. The Mount of Olives was shaken in preparation for that prophesied day when His feet—for the first time since his ascension—will again touch earth.

> "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south." [1]

"Great signs shall there be from heaven," [2] so goes the prediction—and some time since this sign appeared faintly and incipiently. Reports such as this were made: "Meteor 600 feet in length, like a gigantic, blazing skyrocket passes over city" . . . "Large and blazing meteorite outshines the moon in brilliance" . . . "A conspicuous spectacle, a large meteor, probably derived from Halley's periodical comet; curious feature was its extremely long flight from the west side of Aquarius to past Eta Virginis." Phenomena in the skies will be magnified and multiplied—but not until the general climax will they develop to the full. Then, like the Shakespearean characters, one man will say to another: "Who ever knew the heavens menace so?" and the other, seeing the connection between human and cosmic affairs, will answer:

[1] Zechariah 14:4.
[2] St. Luke 21:11.

"Those that have known the earth so full of faults." . . .[1]

Meantime the grim tale of earthquakes has continued, and 1928 soon outdid that of the preceding year. In its first month, shocks were felt in Africa, Central America, and several parts of Europe. In the second month, Austria, Portugal, Japan, Mexico, the Philippines, and again in Palestine. In the third month, Central Asia, Mexico, Messina, and California experienced shocks. April saw the evil grow, and Johannesburg, Peru, Mexico, Salonika, were shaken—Smyrna was much affected and there occurred the disasters at Philippopolis and Corinth. In the following months disturbances continued, but every reader can make a personal study and reckoning of these outbreaks, which supply one important sign of the times. They will continue and increase as the Age-end draws nearer.

"Natural—it is all perfectly natural," protest some folk, including even a scientist or two, as though determined to see in this sign of the times no inner meaning. Yet before this modern epidemic of earthquakes, we heard little about earthquakes being natural, in the sense of normal: geological preaching inclined the other way, and its

[1] *Julius Caesar.*

burden was of slow, horizontal thrusts and erosions, of the gradual, ever so gradual crumpling, crinkling, and wrinkling of the face of the earth, rather than of catastrophic eruptions and quakes. Earthquakes may be termed natural, in the sense that they are part of Nature's observed behaviour; but earthquakes, like disease and crime, are pathological, natural but not healthy. They are also significant. Even mere inexpressive taps, when timed and combined according to the Morse code, become eloquent, and convey a definite message to the understanding mind. So with the upheavals of Nature, which constitute the signs of the times. Like the ship's wireless-man, in a crisis, Nature is broadcasting the message that things are wrong.

> ". . . When these prodigies
> Do so conjointly meet, let not man say,
> 'These are their reasons; they are natural';
> For I believe, they are portentous things
> Unto the climate that they point upon" . . .

Nature's convulsions are so arranged, synchronised, and emphasised, as to warn the people of to-day that the Age-end approaches, and that Jesus, great God, Saviour, and King will soon return.

"Nothing exceptional," is another word about the natural upheavals of the present time which is contradicted by popular common sense and common vision, for ordinary folk recognise that of late earthquakes and storms have, in fact, been exceptional.

An important question! How squares the dogma of the all-sufficiency of evolution with the modern increase of earthquakes? Increase there is, and that cannot be denied. You have such an observer as Sir Napier Shaw, the meteorologist, using the expression "this year of hurricanes and earthquakes." The newspapers, in editorial and news columns, proclaim it. This from the London *Daily Mail* is an example:

MORE EARTHQUAKES

Increasing Frequency

The earth appears to be getting more unstable.

According to calculations by the well-known seismologist Milne, from about the year 1650 there has been a rapid increase in the frequency of bad earthquakes, the numbers in successive half-centuries from 1600 being 3, 10, 15, 17, and 30.

Milne further suggests that there has been a corresponding increase in volcanic activity.

"Earth and Sky Riddles"—under this heading the London *Daily News* says that present-day earthquakes, besides terrifying local populations, are causing the world at large to ask "whether these happenings betoken anything wrong with the earth." A typical comment is that editorially made by the *London Morning Post:*

> "Even the most casual observer cannot fail to be impressed with what seems to be a remarkable series of earthquakes which have been recorded in the course of the present year."

The *Spectator,* urging its readers not to miss the remarkable article by Professor Sitter of Leyden University, in the scientific weekly, *Nature,* on recent change in the earth's rotation, says:

> A collapse of the whole of the Himalayas would not have been disturbance enough to have thus altered the earth's moment of inertia: probably this strange and almost unchronicled change in the world's affairs was due to some cataclysm at its core, some slip-

ping of the masses that lie between us and the nadir, if we understand the Professor rightly.

The *Referee,* admitting that there has been a surprising number of earthquakes in different parts of the world, asks, "are these things the precursors of some great catastrophe?" and remarks:

> The condition of unstable equilibrium which we all note with apprehension among the nations, appears to have its counterpart in that of the earth itself, and a certain complacency must be permitted to the prophets, whose predictions seem to have a singular knack of fulfilling themselves just now. That Bulgaria should have endured one hundred and fifty separate and distinct shocks of earthquake since Wednesday night is enough to satisfy the most exacting critic of the seers.

On the morrow of one great earthquake, the London *Daily Mail* editorially said:

> Thus is tragically demonstrated the ultimate powerlessness of Man against the forces of Nature. The earth, which sup-

ports him, like the sea, which carries him on his journeys, can also slay him.

The scientific study of earthquakes has advanced rapidly in recent years.

Unhappily, the new discoveries point not towards but away from the possibility of ever bringing this terrible force under human control.

The London *Times,* taking editorial note of the hurricane of September 1928 in the West Indies and Florida, "the worst that can be remembered," said: "In the face of disaster for which he himself can be blamed; such as fire man can fight . . . Before the violence of nature on land he can do nothing. In earthquake and hurricane, he can only wait, helpless . . . no effort man can make will alter his fate."

Hence the need of One, mightier than men, to subdue these disturbances of nature when He returns! Theologians and philosophers whose hope for the world's future is in mere natural evolutionary process, must again be asked, what place have earthquakes in their gospel! Surely a properly evolving earth, after millions—or is it millions of millions?—of years should be getting less, not more violent! Their very uncomforting

reply seems to be: "The earth's crust is settling down, and sometimes this settling down, as abundantly evidenced of late, is accompanied by earthquakes." Did we not say it before! This evolution is a most hazardous, perilous, deadly affair. "From all the hazards, delays, perils and deathshocks of Evolution, good Lord deliver us": this petition the English bishops might well have added when seeking to revise the Prayer Book.

Cruel comfort, as an Epistle to the Corinthians and others smitten by earthquakes in this closing time of the age, is the modernist message: "This is all an inevitable, necessary part of evolution."

The sufferers themselves, according to reports, prefer the Biblical view of such catastrophes—that they are material symptoms of a spiritual disease; not part of God's order, but a breach of His order. The Archbishop of Modernism (no allusion here to any archbishop usually so called) says that there is "order in the Cosmos," and that these upheavals of Nature can be "explained." Science, however, only describes how these happen and cannot explain *why* they happen. Obviously the Archbishop of Modernism is far less convincing than the Apostle who proclaims that, in conflict with order, there is also *disorder in the Cosmos,* but then explains that

Creation, though now subjected to corruption and decay, nevertheless is thus subjected in *hope*—the hope of its deliverance from the bondage of corruption. Even the Creation, so the Apostle shows, is looking toward the second advent, when Jesus will be revealed in His glory as He is; for *then,* Christians will show forth, as they do not yet, in the fulness of their Christian character; then the nations will become "the kingdom of our God and of His Christ." Then Nature likewise will be ordered and made harmonious, "because the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Meanwhile, "we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."[1] Hence storms rage, the sea and the waves roaring, hence great earthquakes in divers places, Nature, as the great day approaches, straining and striving more and more in her bondage of corruption.

The human body shares the disturbance of the earth, its dwelling-place. Medical science keeps this in some check, and yet the evil is there and disease is like a wild beast only held in by a chain, and a long one at that. The medical profession has a great war to wage in these times—for all

[1] Romans 8:22.

the modern discoveries, improved sanitation and public knowledge of health—against such foes as heart disease and cancer. This last, a cellular insurrection, as it has been called, works in the bodily organism of the race, in a fashion typical of other disorders in human society and in Nature, and makes its victims, just as does war civil and international, just as do tempests and earthquakes.

Scientifically, we have discovered, what was already known by revelation, that the universe is a unity indeed—the multiple effect of a single cause; the diversiform expression of a uniform energy. The universe is one vast organism, and as with that lesser organism, the human body, a disorder, even small in itself, can infect and corrupt the whole.

Again, as with the human organism so with the universe, a spiritual or a physic disorder can produce very evident and distressing physical effects. The spiritual disorder that corrupts the material creation—what is it? It is revolt against Christ Jesus, He who is creation's Head and Fount. The revolt against Him is a fact of vast extent and importance in the modern world. Jesus as man is considerably talked about and praised; but Jesus is less and less recognised as

God. And yet the fancied Jesus, man but not God, of whom they write, is such an unreal, unconvincing figure. Abstract the oxygen from the hydrogen, and there is no water! Abstract his deity from His manhood, and there is no Jesus!

The highest praise of Jesus as man but not God is the heinous offence of faint praise. There was one man who betrayed Him with a kiss; to laud his manhood, while denying His godhead is to dethrone him with the same. The proper order of the universe depends upon the Lordship of Jesus, "who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." [1]

Two linked teachings of Old and New Testaments find place here,

> "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall all men come;

[1] Colossians 1:15-17.

and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." [1]

This Old Testament prediction is renewed and interpreted in the New Testament prediction [2] that Christ Jesus is this Lord unto whom, one day, every knee shall bow and every tongue shall swear, to whom has been given a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. . . . For, as we read, he is above all things and in him all things consist, and it pleased the Father that in him shall all fulness dwell—and "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." [3]

The negation of the deity and lordship of Jesus must lead to cataclysm; it is a spiritual revolt which necessarily has its effect in the material creation. The relation between the human spirit and the cosmos entire—this is scientifically understandable. And who, in these days, when the effectual working of unseen forces is a commonplace of daily life, will deny the potency of human thought, emotion, and will, either as exerted

[1] Isaiah 45:23, 24.
[2] Philippians 2:10, 11.
[3] Colossians 2:9.

for, or as exerted against, the fulfilment of the divine purpose to bring all things into one in Christ Jesus? . . .

Remember—no peace pacts can bind Nature in convulsion! Even if mankind could outlaw war, they cannot outlaw earthquakes. Yet these natural calamities may grow to be more deadly than war itself and a mightier problem for human governments. So the calming of Nature necessitates the return of Him, whom even the winds and waves and quaking of earth will then obey. Only He, and no one else, is able to pacify Nature, whose violence threatens the very life of populations. Nature will be pacified when He comes: because when the nations obey and worship Him and all spiritual revolt is ended, then Nature itself will be brought into the general harmony of the Kingdom of God, at last came upon earth.

CHAPTER XIII

Signs of the Times: Moral Conditions

PRIDE and prejudice kept many of us from the prognostoscope through which we could have foreseen the course things are now taking: pride and prejudice still keep some, even in troublous times, from looking to see the divine ending to the human tale.

The modern state of society is not as forecast by the hopeful reformers, who expected that human society, under the influence of democracy, would surely, and not slowly, evolve into the good, the true, and the beautiful. Straightaway we can acknowledge one great advance: namely, that society has become more considerate of the masses, more concerned with their welfare and that of their children; in a word, more apt to follow the example and borrow the ideas of Christian charity. But if the world has all of a sudden grown kind to the weak, is not this because the weak have become strong? After all, the masses are now electorally powerful, and are increasingly aware of their power. No wonder they are bet-

ter treated! All powerful classes house, feed, clothe, and educate themselves and their children as well as possible. The now powerful masses are following this tradition and compelling the governments dependent upon their votes to look after their interests. Furthermore, powerful classes are always blessed with many friends, are able to command the sympathy and service of others. Naturally, therefore, the powerful, power-conscious masses and their children are gaining friends and commanding sympathy and service, and so enjoying a prosperity, which used not to be theirs. Yes, power and plenty go hand in hand. The masses can be prosperous beyond their own most socialistic dreams on certain conditions, including these: that war, civil or international, does not devastate and destroy wealth and the possibility of producing wealth; that physical disturbances of the earth do not too greatly disturb affairs; that the masses assent to the progressive use of new scientific discovery and method; that they consent to discipline during the hours of work, as does a sailor on board ship. A vast increase of wealth and its wide diffusion among the people, abolishing poverty and assuring great comfort with ample leisure to all—that, in the

absence of extraneous upheaval, might happen even in this Age.

But prosperity is not enough! Man does not live by bread alone. Material needs may be satisfied, yet the other problems of life and of human society remain. The trouble is that classes or masses, however prosperous and politically free, are not immune from moral evils. Their very freedom, for all its benefits, may mean decreased moral restraint, for human beings are apt to be rather better moralists for others than for themselves, and to require many virtues of those under their control. The end of that control may thus be the beginning of new temptation to those who gain freedom, with a corresponding weakening in those who once controlled, of the self-restraining idea of responsibility and *noblesse oblige.*

So modern freedom, for all its advantages, does mean that morally the rein is on the horse's neck. Less and less is there any restraining human authority—relativity reigns—or rather does not, since it rejects any reign and rule in the moral sphere. In the name of relativity, no code or standard can be fixed, lest it conflict with what X deems good for X, or what Y esteems true for Y, or what seems beautiful to Z. Arts, pleasures, as well as customs, are unsettled, because standards

are disappearing. Human authority, driven from its former perches, still hovers o'er the scene, an eagle restlessly seeking where to alight; hence the present-day menace of revolution, which is a phase of the age-long struggle for power. These conjoint forms of unrest are shaking the foundations of society in a manner which is far more cataclysmic than evolutionary! The prophetic mirror has foreshown it. Present-day voices are now lamenting it, and they shall give us their verdict upon the actual state of things.

Morbid tendencies in modern Art have been denounced by Sir Reginald Blomfield, late president of the Royal Institute of British Architects, who sees a growing impatience with the past and with the training and discipline necessary to learn its lesson, and what is worse, "an instinct for the morbid, the hideous and the unclean," which "finds its violent expression" in a good deal of modern European sculpture and painting. The efforts now being made to revolutionise art and literature he regards as only the echo of a larger movement that has spread with rather alarming rapidity since the war. Sanity and the reticence of consummate art are, he says, out of fashion nowadays, and with them is lost the sense of values, the revolutionaries not being the heralds

of advance they claim to be, and the dawn they announce so boldly being what a recent writer has called "a false dawn." The retort will doubtless be that such a critic is simply an enemy of the *new*. But is this new tendency really *new?* Since the Greeks, since Michael Angelo, have there not been departures from the ideal of classic beauty? Even Egypt saw a like swing of the pendulum of art, a like move to the archaic. In art as in morals, there is nothing new under the sun. After examining remains of the art of various bygone times, Sir Flinders Petrie, as we have noticed, regards what seemed in their day to be *"new"* departures in art, as a symptom of the senility of these now dead civilisations. A President of the Royal Academy complains that:

> "Some there are who, seeing in many of the finest examples of art something that is above and beyond and therefore different from the everyday nature that they see around them, grasp only this difference, and ignoring the principle that guides it, imagine they display genius by deviating from Nature in any manner they may choose, however morbid, unwholesome or contorted this may be. The extreme expression of this

mentality is one of the sinister signs of the present day."

Among the deeper causes thereof may be, thinks the same critic, "some dire disease of the soul" and he goes on to say:

> "Is it not possible that that catastrophe [the war] has created in some ill-regulated minds a bitter spirit of resentment and revolt against everything that ever was or had been in heaven or earth, a burning demand for new standards shorn of every vestige of the old?
>
> "Amid all the general upheaval and unrest there are some on whom the burden of civilisation sits but lightly, and who are ever on the watch for opportunity to strip themselves of all restraint and plunge into the welter of their own atavism. A miasma has been spread around from which it is difficult to escape. This curious and unnatural madness can be traced through most parts of this semi-civilised world."

Disappointment is in store for those who think that disorder in art and morals is due to war and

will pass simply because the 1914-18 struggle is receding into the past. For one thing, future war did not become impossible on Armistice Day, 1918, and, what is more, the particular conditions of to-day were beginning to be apparent before the war, and would, we may be sure, have developed without it. Nothing is more unjust than to charge moral unrest or crime waves against ex-soldiers as such, and this is proved by any assembly of the British Legion (Americans will doubtless say the same of theirs), when observers may note the lines and the expression indelibly marked upon those soldier faces by their self-denial during the war. We must look more to those who stayed at home at ease, and to those who grew up since the war, we must, indeed, look further than the war, for the cause of the troubles of to-day. Social degeneracy can proceed in time of peace as in time of war. The absence of war is not the only thing required to make heaven upon earth. . . .

The present restiveness of mankind under the moral code which for so long had been recognised, if not invariably obeyed, is a symptom of the Age-end, and a proof that the moral Lawgiver must and will return in order firstly to re-

affirm his moral authority and make it world-wide, and, secondly, to adjust world conditions, as well as incline hearts, to his divine law, that these all may harmonise. For the churches to preach this hope of his coming would be the best way of maintaining moral standard in the meantime.

Musicians make their protest against a degeneracy threatening their art. "To avoid the fate of the great Empires of antiquity which dominated and declined," the nations of to-day must, in Sir Henry Coward's view,[1] be on their guard against "the present decided lowering of pre-war standards in ethics, morals, language and conduct, and the exploitation of low types of pleasure in the younger generation." History shows that the decay of great nations has been caused by the nature of the ethics and morality derived from the form of their pleasures, said Sir Henry Coward, and proceeded to condemn primitive music founded, according to him, on crude rhythms, emphasising the grotesque, and making both music and instruments farcical. Kubelik has spoken to the same effect, adding that the music of the great masters can be traced back to a Christian origin, and that:

[1] Mus: Doc:, late Lecturer in Music, Sheffield University.

"Music as we know it and love it has come down the ages to us hand in hand with Christianity, with our religion. With the coming of Christ and the founding of the Church came music, for men tried to express their fervour, their religious feelings, in the most beautiful words wedded to the most beautiful of sound. So in the Church, music was born in its earliest modern form, that of song.

"The little music which existed among the Egyptians and the Greeks bears small relation to that which sprang up in the Church."

So even music pines and wearies or goes astray, until, with all other beauty, it will live anew and better, when the Kingdom of God comes visibly and powerfully to earth.

Fiction is also being accused of decadence disguised as novelty. One reviewer of Anglo-American fiction has been brought to the conclusion that these are "decadent days of a pagan dégringolade." A veritable landslide is diagnosed by a literary critic in the *Manchester Guardian* who thinks that "the landslide to vulgarity is more apparent in the novel than in the play," and remarks:

> "There is, of course, a touch of revolutionary feeling in it. To suppose that history began so far back as the skyscraper or the motor-car is to be an antiquarian; it began after the war, and everything, but especially the 'bourgeois virtues,' which obtained before the war is marked for dectruction."

The danger is, as this critic sees it, that the power of suggestion may operate, and "undisciplined people may be led to imitate in their lives the indiscipline of this modern literary convention."

Nothing new in this, cry the defenders of the times we live in, and they point to the past for proof. They are right in a sense, because human nature does not change, and the desire for the knowledge of evil is among modern men and women, what the Bible reports it to have been in Eve's and Adam's day. The psychology set forth in the Bible is always up to date: the *really* newest psychology is to be found in those ancient pages.

Forbidden fruit still exerts its old spell upon human nature: it pays, therefore, to purvey literary representations of evil. Good things assuredly find appreciation too, for in this Age wheat and tares grow side by side, but in face of certain

modern tendencies it requires high principle and a strong sense of responsibility to refuse to pander to those tendencies, because the representation of evil does attract and does pay.

The drama of to-day, and not least the new photographic sort, is accused by many of stepping down to cater for the taste for the knowledge of evil. The Anglo-American stage is, according to a prominent London dramatic critic, lowered to a level "which can only be compared with that of the Restoration," but one of the older living playwrights thinks the comparison unjust to the Restoration drama, and speaking of this and customs generally, maintains that although there was reckless license in Stuart and Georgian times, it was limited to a very small class of the population, whereas now evil influences are more widely diffused and can more easily reach the younger generation. Licence in language and theme, another dramatic critic complains, is bad enough, but the confusion between plain *right* and *wrong* is an even worse fault in much of modern drama.

Obviously the modern danger to civilisation is the democratisation of the knowledge, and even the practice of evil. Aberrations, once peculiar to a few, either floating on the surface or sunk in the depths of society, would be fatal, if more

or less generalised among the public as a whole. Is humanity a fallen race? is the question asked of the past: it is in the present a falling race, judged by its craze for the knowledge of evil.

The query to be self-addressed by the British and American democracies, men and women alike, is how far they have elevated and are elevating standards, and how far they are using both their political power and their purchasing power to secure the expression of the good, the true, and the beautiful, in terms of life and of recreation, of morals and of art. Otherwise expressed, what safeguards have these democracies provided against the undermining of civilisation during their régime, now and in the future, by its ancient foes, the world, the flesh, and the devil? Warning and appealing, a leading English educationalist and head of an important school says in regard to modern conditions that "those who would guard the young from corruption, yet allow them all possible freedom from self-development, are faced in these days with terribly difficult problems." On his showing, modern democracy, once our hope, has not solved that life and death problem for a nation, the development of its future citizens and rulers.

What say the churches, the especial guardians of righteousness?

A note of pessimism is struck by many of the leaders. According to their critics, they are too pessimistic, and speak of what they fear may be rather than what already is. But let us hear what they have to say, taking some typical utterances of English divines, which might be matched by utterances from like American sources.

Modern Christendom is comparable to Ancient Rome in its decline, thinks the Dean of Westminster, who in a Christmas Day sermon has said that it is not difficult to draw a rough parallel between "the worst conditions of the latter days of the Roman Empire" and present-day "resentment of authority, irresponsibility, luxury and licence and the vice and crime which even stalk abroad." Yet there is no cause to be down-hearted, he urges, because "all must tend one way in the end; for the fact remains that the most potent influence in the world's history has been, and is, incomparably, the influence of the Babe who was born on Christmas Day in the city of David. It is Jesus, and not theories about Jesus, that the world needs to-day." Understood as a proclamation of the coming and kingdom of Jesus, nothing could be truer than those words, but practical experience

and the Scriptures plainly deny that things will or can come right with the world, until the regal return of "Jesus whom the world needs to-day."

The Archbishop of York is among the optimists. Modern youth, says he, are "in no mood to listen to the voice of religious authority," but are thinking for themselves and will accept no answers which do not express or appeal to vital and real experience." His diagnosis is doubtless accurate and this, of course, is where the signs of the times come in, because, together with the whole historic course of ratified prophecy, they supply an experimental touchstone of Christian truth, which, we may again insist, is far more convincing to a scientifically-minded generation, and far more dependable, far safer and more wholesome than any mystical experiences, sought after by those who think to find Christ, independently of the Bible and its revelation of Him through a private and personal revelation peculiar to themselves.

A moderator of the Presbyterian Church of England, Dr. Carnegie Simpson,[1] has deplored the "undoubted loosening of moral principles" and the "view of much philosophy that all morality is relative, with no absolute right or wrong in

[1] Addressing the General Assembly.

it, and has indeed no basis except the shifting sand of what public opinion may tolerate in one age and not in another." All that, said he, affects the modern mind, and especially the mind of youth, and "means that many people have no kind of principle about morals." Believing, though he does, that very many people, "despite all the materialism and paganism and pleasure lust around them," are conscious that if "we are really seeking individual happiness or social security," we shall not find these in "the bastard freedom which asserts itself in many of our plays and novels, in so much of our modern life," Dr. Carnegie Simpson considers that even the seriousness felt by people so-minded, has often the "note rather of disillusionment and pessimism" and that much of the "carnival of modern life betrays this in the very disguising of it." His remedy? It is to make Christians, whose task it will then be to make a Christian world. To make Christians is good, but to do that, in these days, the victorious argument used by the first Christian preachers is needful—that of prophecy fulfilled and to be fulfilled. As for making a Christian world, if Christians could make it, it would have been made before now, and at the very least the churches could prevent some of the developments

which Christian leaders deplore. Something, then, is needed beyond the efforts of Christians themselves. Evidently, Christ himself must come again if the world is ever to be made Christian.

Frankly pessimistic is the Bishop of Durham, who believes that there is a rift between civilisation and Christianity which is "widening into a breach and threatens to become total." Civilised mankind having hitherto failed to find any substitute for Christ as the guardian of individuality and the controller of sensual passion, civilisation in parting company with Christianity, declares the Bishop, is "restoring the features of pre-Christian civilisation, its essential cruelty, its prevalence of suicide, its squalid superstition and above all its unbridled sensuality," for, he insists, "a great revolt against the morality of Christ's religion is proceeding, and has in recent years gained formidable force." Mistaken or otherwise, Dr. Hensley Henson sees things thus darkly and, worse still, he points no way out, for if the churches have been powerless to prevent the malady he describes, they are equally powerless to cure it! The logical conclusion of his argument, though he does not state it, is that Christ Himself must return to do the good that cannot be done through the instrumentality of the churches,

and to undo the harm they have not proved able to avert.

Until that day—be it still far off or be it as near as the signs indicate—a measure of health would be maintained by a revival of the apostolic Christianity. But that requires the apostolic method of presenting Christianity, as a religion, which is based, as surely as any of the sciences, upon visible, tangible, extrinsic evidence; it requires the apostolic method of the preaching of prophecy fulfilled and to be fulfilled in Jesus, the Christ, at His advent. The force of this argument is even greater in our day than it was in apostolic days, owing to the now-present signs of the nearing of His second Advent. Christians are logically invincible if they take their stand upon Biblical prophecy.

Some one wants the Bible re-edited to fit the theories of science and of criticism. We have seen how presently impossible it would be to adapt the Bible to science, because science is ever changing, and also how needless, because science is moving Biblewards, toward the ultimate scientific generalisation that all things consist in Christ Jesus, the source of creative energy. "Modern" scholarship, as they call it, is even less qualified as censor of the Bible, because itself subject to

censorship by modern archaeology's marvellous and increasing revelation of the past. Only recently, for example, M. René Dussaud addressing a learned society upon hieratic texts found in Egypt by M. Sethe, which date back to 2000 B. C. and throw light upon the history and geography of Palestine, Phoenicia, and Syria, insisted upon the "support which these texts give to certain passages in the Old Testament." As the London *Times* lately remarked editorially, the increasing archaeological evidence "that a multitude of Homeric, classical, and Biblical traditions were based upon fact, must compel even the most superior moderns to revise their criticisms of the chroniclers, whether epic poets, annalists or historians, who collected and recorded them." Scholarly imaginings and fancies must yield before the solid objects dug up by the archaeological spade. Modern scholarship, in so far as it conflicts with traditional views of Old and New Testaments, is like to collapse, and where will modernism be then, poor thing! Wisdom and prudence dictate a departure from the edifice ere it fall. The rock of prophecy is firmer than the shifting and changeable conclusions of so-called scholarship: thereupon can a Christian minister stand confident. Even in face of world evils that

otherwise would make him despair, he can preach the coming of Jesus Christ to bring God's kingdom upon earth, because he knows that the darker grows the hour, the surer is the dawn. . . .

Do laymen take a brighter view than clergy of existing social and moral conditions? Probably they do, on the whole, but are they better witnesses, or so bold to confess the darker view if they share it! A British member of Parliament, Lord Hugh Cecil, is not wholly optimistic, for he is on record as saying:

> "In many ways we live in an age of disintegration, old things are passing away. There is now a general corroded atmosphere, which may easily end in, not precisely revolution, but general disintegration of society. There is the growing weakness of all moral restrictions and a growing sense that everybody may do as he likes."

This account of an anti-social self-will and of tendencies to disintegration amounts, more or less, to a modern paraphrase of the Apostle's: In the last days perilous times shall come. . . .[1]

One may pity the men and women who see a darkening cloud overhanging the world, but do

[1] II Timothy 3:1.

not forsee the gold radiance of the Sun of Righteousness, waiting to break through the cloud and irradiate the world. . . .

Whether or not the world is now worse than it was is not worth disputing about, for it has never been good enough: at the best, it was and is nothing to boast of. How can we even pretend, asks Mr. Augustine Birrell, that the history of any country is not a record of man's inhumanity to man! So human beings even break the second and lesser commandment, besides breaking the first and great commandment to love God. Even these so-called humaner days find many broken-hearted for want of a helping hand: and even the dead seem to be decreasingly protected by the ancient poet's maxim, "malice feeds on the living: after life is over it rests." The paradoxical preparation, by this self-styled humanest of generations, of the most annihilating and unrestrained means and modes of warfare ever dreamt of, is also disconcerting. Perhaps, then, the apostle-prophet's saying is after all true, and in the last days of this age perilous times really will come, and by their very coming prove the nearness of the Golden Age of Christ's millennial reign.

Credulous, pathetically credulous, were those who used to believe in a Golden Age to be brought

in by human agency, through the reform of institutions. That illusion is departed: The voice of the people turns out to be not the voice of God, who therefore must in due time speak, not through that human medium but, with His own voice.

Novelist-prophets and others already sound the alarm, and assure us that the theory of the sovereignty of the people evaporates in practice, and in matters of government what is everybody's business becomes nobody's business; that we must now hope everything, not of majorities, but of minorities, of a chosen, and it would appear a self-chosen few, a sort of revived oligarchy and, we may add, nothing really new and untried.

It is just the same with the search for a "new morality," which the seekers claim would be better adapted to modern mankind. No new morality has been found: A cynic has declared that modern folk cannot invent even one new sin, and how much less can they invent a new morality! Every supposed new invention will prove to have been tried long ago, for "Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us." [1] The more restive becomes human nature against

[1] Ecclesiastes 1:10.

standards that for nineteen centuries have been, if not always, honoured in the observance, yet honoured and aspired to as ideal, the stronger is the evidence of the second advent as a need and as a fact. For the second advent of Christ will revivify, it will exalt to new authority, the Christian morality, will incline hearts to accept it, will make human conditions harmonious with it, so that this yoke will be a joyous one.

Paganism!—this cry raised by Christian ministers, about manners and customs of the day, amounts to an assertion that Christianity's influence is declining and human society reverting to its pre-Christian state. Is Christ then defeated, in their view, or do they look to see Him return, in all his power, to order and adjust all things divinely?

Leave to romancers the mere fancy that some other way will do; for example, that a great trial and trouble will, of itself, purify the world and teach mankind to live happily, kindly, morally, peacefully thenceforward! The Great War, it was hoped, would so result, but the post-war world has not fulfilled that hope. Some one wrote a play about a comet advancing to destroy the earth in three weeks' time. The last act showed the last half hour before the crash, when

all came face to face with the truth about themselves, as the deadly comet rushed to destroy the earth. It just missed! The comet, says a reviewer, passed with flashes and thunderclaps, leaving a world chastened and uplifted into a new sense of life's value. How long would *that* last? History since Armistice Day, 1918, supplies the answer.

The Messianic promise[1] "to bring in everlasting righteousness" is the one open door of hope, for, if "righteousness exalteth a nation" what the lack thereof will do has been shown by many a downfallen nation. The world was never so ripe and ready as now to hear the Gospel of the Kingdom; Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand! Perhaps the world is quicker than the churches to know the greatness of its need. "Is this the serpent's hour," one read in a quite worldly quarter, "is this the serpent's hour, for he reigns, he dominates the history of this epoch."

A great disillusionment has come to thinking humanity in these latter days. Lord Bryce's biography shows that even he, typical though he was of his earlier and optimistic generation, did not escape this wave of discouragement.

[1] Daniel 9:24.

"Man perfects many things, except himself," wrote a French publicist lately, "he has kept his age-old vices, his ignoble passions, he has not yet succeeded in ridding himself of any one of his seven capital sins, which he is inclined by his nature to commit daily: it is an argument against the theory of evolution." And there followed the reflection: "There are no gods upon the earth: the only One who dared to venture upon earth was despised and crucified. . . ."

That very God will come again to earth, declares prophecy. What wonderful tidings for despondent men and women! "I wish he would come. May you be right: I hope he will come!" such responses one often hears from thoughtful men and women. The day of scoffing has passed! Christian ministers, considering whether to preach the second advent, may be assured that they have no ridicule to face from the general public; but quite the contrary. The amazing discoveries of science, the recent extraordinary changes in human affairs, have made the second advent seem to the lay mind to be easily within the power of God.

People wonder, and fear in wondering, how the present upheaval, especially the ferment of Bolshevism the chief dread of so many, can,

through merely human effort and wisdom and action, subside into any harmonious, lasting, world-wide order. The great hour and opportunity for the churches has come. Their privilege is to show that the world is in turmoil for the fundamental reason that it is not in allegiance to Jesus Christ as Redeemer, as Lord and King: to show, even, that many who count themselves bulwarks of civilisation are nevertheless bolshevist in the gravest sense, and therefore agents of disorder, because in heart and mind they refuse assent to His divine and sovereign predominance.

CHAPTER XIV

Signs of the Times: Wars and Rumours of Wars

GOING from doctor to doctor, trying one treatment after another, the World, that sick man in search of health, seeks peace. His latest violent attack of war has made him realise, as never before, his chronic, long-standing illness. Therefore, just as a chronically-sick man is always talking about the health that he feels and knows he has not got, while a man who is well takes health for granted, so World keeps on discussing peace, peace, where he feels there is no peace. With human beings, health, if it is not a possession, is an obsession, and in the same way, with the World, peace, not being a possession, is an obsession.

Many peace physicians has modern World been under, of late years—Doctors Woodrow Wilson, Briand, Chamberlain. Afterwards came Dr. Kellogg with a new prescription, but as he candidly wrote himself: "I am not as blind as to believe that the Millennium has arrived." Yet nothing less than the millennium, the reign of Christ, will

put an end to war! As each new physician comes to attend the case, World, with a wan smile of resignation, rather than of hope—after suffering so many disappointing treatments of so many other physicians, he is getting secretly and fearfully doubtful of ever being cured at all—listens to the new treatment proposed. Then, with sinking heart, as one whose last chance fails, World quickly discerns in each new treatment the lack of any new and potent, effectual remedy for his disease. More and more specialists may have been consulted before these words are in print. If only another acute attack of the disease does not come on!

The first necessity is to diagnose World's war-disease properly, and even after a sound diagnosis, the cure has still to be found, and that is a yet greater difficulty. The prime *cause* of war has to be bravely admitted. What is it? It is the lust for domination. The early years of two successive centuries, and those two the latest in time, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, have been made hideous by Napoleonic and Kaiserly power-lust, producing wars for domination. This curse, as proved in 1914-18 by the biggest war ever known until then, has actually increased in

modern times and more in our own century than in any other.

The childlike illusion that war is due simply to "fear," to "armaments" or to other secondary and incidental considerations, cannot hide the gaunt fact that war is mainly due to the lust for power over others; that the sceptre of world domination is the stake for which great war-makers are playing; that when these wade through the life-blood of millions of men they are making for the throne of the world. The world-sceptre is the bone of contention: the supreme *casus belli* is the world-throne. The man who could take away, and take away forever, that bone of contention, that *casus belli,* might perhaps begin to dream of being the world's peacemaker. But no man is able to take it away, and therefore dreams of peace dissolve. No man is able, except One—Jesus the Son of man! He can, and will, take away the cause of war, because the sceptre and the throne of the world are His to take and to hold, in order that ambitious men and nations may never fight for them again! "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." [1]

[1] Hebrews 1:8; Psalm 45:6.

The kingdom of this world will continue to be a temptation to war, until He come whose right it is! Class war to establish a world domination by the so-called proletariat; race or cult war to establish a racial or religious domination; war to make a people or a person dominant—these are modern possibilities. The world, since 1914, has lost such equilibrium as it then possessed—the prize of world authority as it were hovers as a thing to be won and held by the first who can snatch it. The seat of world-power, more evidently than formerly, is empty, the throne untenanted. Therein consists the lure to warfare, the appeal to power-lust. A deterrent is, of course, doubt as to success, but would-be world conquerors are nothing if not audacious, and world-power or downfall has, in all ages, been the note of their battle-cry.

The sense of this underlying and persistent danger of another, more gigantic, struggle for world-power has prompted the continual peace efforts of the past decade. A flaw in all these peace plans is that the nations are set up as judges in their own cause, a system which in national law would not work in restraining individual lawbreakers, and cannot work, internationally, in restraining peacebreaking nations. To look down

from the strangers' gallery at the League of Nations, upon that assemblage of the world's statesmen, including some half-hundred ministers for foreign affairs, with all their various and too often conflicting and even irreconcilable opinions, has been to feel—what one who has witnessed it all, year after year and at every meeting—openly wrote: "There needs some one to lay down the law to them!" Yet no human being could be trusted to do that, and it is the very desire to lay down the law of the world that stirs the ambitious to make wars. Realising this, the smaller nations, especially, clung from the first to the League of Nations as being, they hoped, an alternative to the ruthless law of some too powerful nation. But the ideal League of Nations is not yet here: nor the ideal lawgiver who will form and direct it. But the ideal Lawgiver will come. Then will be formed the ideal League of Nations. . . . For, "it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains . . . and all nations shall flow unto it. For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." [1] Peace will be assured at last—just and impartial as between the weak and

[1] Isaiah 2:2, 3.

the strong, and based upon real security and complete disarmament. For, "He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." [1]

Human peace plans break down on the question of effectually restraining an aggressor—that is to say, of defending the sheepfold, against the wolf who would break through. A unanimous vote on the rights and wrongs of the wolf's proceeding is hard enough to obtain, and united action to repress the wolf, even harder! To do justice as between the stronger and the weaker requires the wisdom and might of the Prince of Peace in person.

Of the signs of His coming, one is the prevalence of wars and rumours of wars. In that sense the climax of war is the promise of peace—the increase to the maximum of the peril and evil of war, is the sign of deliverance from war through the reign of the Prince of Peace.

The prophets have announced His coming. Visionary, do you say? On the contrary: it is human peace plans that are visionary, that are

[1] Isaiah 2:4.

unfulfilled, that fail! Consider the kaleidoscopic series of these peace plans, beginning, if you will, with the "outlawry" of war by the French Revolution which "declared peace on the world"—whereupon Europe was soon aflame with war!

War was outlawed by the French Revolution, just as many hopeful beings thought it would be outlawed by the Russian Revolution, a hundred and more years later! Robespierre, in March 1790, demanded that "perpetual peace be decreed"; Volney exclaimed: "*Messieurs,* you will convoke, and I venture to say it, the Assembly of the Nations," whereupon Mirabeau moved, and it was carried that "the French nation renounces all wars of conquest and will not employ its forces against the liberties of any people."

War against Belgium was outlawed under the former neutralisation treaty, but war happened!

War was outlawed again for the *n*th time, over a year ago, when the League of Nations Assembly resolved that "war is, and remains prohibited." This rebel, war, has always come back as often as he has been outlawed. The law is evidently too weak to cope with him. So the first thought on hearing that war is again to be outlawed is—will war obey?

Pathetic it is to see how short-lived are the

human peace panaceas. Hardly was the League of Nations launched in its voyage to the haven of peace, than a leak was discovered in the ship, a gap in the Covenant. To stop the leak, to fill the gap, has been vainly attempted ever since. This gap, as defined by Lord Cecil, is that, if the league Council were not unanimous, then war, even if deemed aggressive by every member of the Council with but a single exception, would be "left to take its course." A peacebreaking nation could, therefore, with the aid of just one accomplice on the Council, hold up the League and overthrow its victim.

Another serious flaw in the League system is, of course, that it does not include all nations.

Security is still the cry of the weaker nations and, if the League does not give security, it is impossible to say that any other peace project of the day would do so, for none of them provide for that irresistible power united to perfect justice which are essential to real peace on earth.

League, Locarno, Peace Pacts—in every one in turn there is always something wanting! It came as something of a shock to find General Smuts, for instance, declaring, after a decade, that the League of Nations is not enough. But none of these human peace projects can possibly be

enough, because they all split upon the rock of human nature. "Many forces are active in the world," sadly remarked the London *Times,* which treaties, pacts, and covenants "do not in the least restrain," and

> "there are times when the League of Nations appears as an ethical academy as compared, say, with the Churches, who are aware of the heights and the depths and have their long, sorrowful experience of the subtle ways of the heart of man:—the contrast persists between the teachings of Rousseau and whatever is permanent in the old doctrine of original sin."

Christ Jesus, who alone can master sin, will put an end to war.

The supernatural factor in war is commonly ignored and human proposals for peace are very hollow in consequence—but the supernatural factor assuredly exists, and with this only the divine Prince of Peace can deal at His coming.

Meantime, the nations cannot agree even upon disarmament, though this is but a minor part of the peace question. A little while ago, disarmament was the hope of many, but the difficulty of arriving at any agreement, and the preference of

the nations for disarming others rather than themselves, as well as the relativity of disarmament—its impossibility in a real sense—became only too evident. Even if all armies were disbanded and munitions destroyed, the industrial nations would still be armed in comparison to the agricultural nations: we know with what ease and speed factories can be turned into war factories, and produce vast munition supplies. And if industrialism itself were suppressed, nations could revert to bows and arrows, or even fight with sticks and stones. "I have never been able to see," said Lord Balfour lately, "how disarmament will give us any security against war, for important as disarmament is, we cannot forget that most of the wars in history have been carried out by what to our eyes seem very petty armaments." . . .

"I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth and will make them to lie down safely." Can any human power promise as much? The messianic role is offered by some to the United States. But is any nation equal to it? Sir Austen Chamberlain has disclaimed, on behalf of Great Britain, the honourable but humanly impossible task of guarantor of world peace, urging that to defend every menaced frontier upon

earth, or even in Europe, is far beyond even British strength. Can the United States, any more than the British, undertake to go to the rescue of every threatened nation, to deal by some effectual action with every disturbance of world peace? Nothing short of this will avail, because it is by this time a commonplace that the smallest war, starting anywhere, may spread like a prairie fire to many, perhaps to all nations.

The present craving for assured peace evidently implies a present fear of war—for if nations were not in constant dread of war, they would not be harping as they do on peace. Needless here to recapitulate all the fears and rumours of war and the various danger-zones on the earth's surface. They are but too well known. The passionate insistence of the smaller nations upon security is in itself tantamount to a rumour of war. All the more so, that nations who were neutral, and in that sense scatheless, in the 1914 war, are now also crying out for security—with Holland taking the lead!

Rumours of war are, then, a feature of these very days—and rumours of war are a sign of the nearing end of this Age and the beginning of the next age. But, it will be said, wars and rumours of wars have been going on all through

the Age; why then take them now as a sign that the Age is ending? Because the warfare of the past was never so devastating as the warfare we have known, and the rumours of wars never so appalling as the rumours now noised abroad. Recent warfare has been the most terrible ever known, and far more destructive modes of fighting have since been prepared. Air warfare, gas warfare, and who shall say what new horrors, will make future conflicts more frightful than ever before.

The evolution of war is toward greater and greater violence. What a comforting thought for our modernist theologians! Here, in the increasing frightfulness of war, *we at last discover evolution actually at work.* Evolution caught in the very act! It suggests the suspicion that such evolution is Satan's staging! Yes! Satan's staging, surely, is this gruesome drama of so-called evolution, with its strife in nature and its ever deadlier wars and rumours thereof. In their attitude toward all that, modernist theologians are mistaken. Even so modern a work as Dr. Williams' *Ideas of the Fall and Origin of Sin* recognises it. In his pages we read these words:

> "The origin of evil is to be sought in the voluntary rebellion of finite created wills, such rebellion having taken place prior to the appearance of the human species on this planet."

We find, too, allusion to the "unknown mysterious agency which has dominated the world for aeons before man was." A step toward the traditional interpretation of the Bible, is this modern recognition of world-evil as the fruit of rebellion against God, who, as Dr. Williams insists, is infinite in power and goodness and love, and must, therefore, have created the world purely good, including no evil at all, and if, when he comes to humanity's part, he is less strictly Biblical, he yet attributes to man "some action or system of actions, whereby man aligned himself with the rebellious power and showed that he had partially thrown in his lot with the forces of evil which were already at work in the Universe." From that, the same writer goes on to assume a relation between extra-human, spiritual evil, evil in human life, and subhuman evil as we see it in nature. If savagery and cruelty are expressions of a fundamental law, pursues Dr. Williams, how evil must be that law and how deep its discordance

with the will of the all-loving Creator revealed by Christ, who clothes the lilies of the field and without whom not one sparrow falls to the ground! God did not, he protests, create a universe compelled by the inner necessity of its being to evolve the evil things, but in the beginning God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good. Dr. Williams concludes thus:

> "To explain evil in Nature, no less than in man, we are compelled to assume a Fall—a revolt against the will of the Creator, a declension from the beauty and glory which God stamped upon His work at the beginning."

The modernist theology which looks to human effort and natural process, and not Christ's coming, to bring God's Kingdom upon earth, is, by such tokens, losing its grip, and minds are breaking free from its influence. . . .

Witnesses crowd upon one another to warn us how appalling will be the next war—Mr. Winston Churchill, for instance, who has written:

> "Certain sombre facts emerge, solid, inexorable, like the shapes of mountains from

drifting mist. It is established that henceforward whole populations will take part in war, all doing their utmost, all subjected to the fury of the enemy. . . . It is probable—nay, certain—that among the means which will next time be at their disposal will be agencies and processes of destruction wholesale, unlimited, and, perhaps, once launched, uncontrollable.

"Death stands at attention, obedient, expectant, ready to serve, ready to shear away the peoples *en masse;* ready, if called on, to pulverise, without hope of repair, what is left of civilisation. He awaits only the word of command."

As these pages leave the author's hand, the cry of peace, peace is heard, but also the murmuring of the fear of war, a murmuring louder than it has ever been since the last war.

No wonder, then, that intelligent folk in their thousands are turning for light to the prophecies that never yet have failed and are putting all their hope of world peace in the promise and the heralding signs of the visible, personal return and reign of him whose name shall be called The Prince of Peace.

CHAPTER XV

Signs of the Times: The Jews in Palestine

ZIONISM is the sign of all signs of Messiah's coming. How wonderful it is that just as the Jews are attaining a greater influence than they have ever had in the Gentile world, there should be this turning again to Zion!

Zionism is a very great cause, a very great movement. The belittling jest or doubt of some Gentile critics is of no account. The writer of these pages is better qualified by experience, than some, to judge the significance and the prospects of Zionism, having been concerned in another movement, which began as a weak and small thing and eventuated in the enfranchisement of millions of women who, from being politically non-existent, became numerically predominant, with a corresponding change in their whole social influence. As great a transformation in human institutions as the world has ever known! Zionism, to an eye thus trained in the school of practical experience, has, and had from the beginning, all the mark and promise of a practical success.

The Zionist pioneer, Herzl, spoke the sheer truth when in 1897, on the conclusion of the first Zionist Congress, he said: "I have founded the Jewish State." That year, 1897, marked the starting point of modern Zionism: the idea took root in the Jewish mind. Twenty years later, in 1917, the phase of realisation began. Just in the same way women's enfranchisement in Great Britain, now a great accomplished fact, was an idea in a few minds for twice as long, forty years and more, before the phase of realisation began in the first decade of the present century, and ended in victory in the second decade. Modern Zionism has followed a like course. One well remembers the day when, from women themselves, the idea of voting, because unfamiliar, met with indifference, and even, where some were concerned, resistance. They were accustomed to being voteless: why not, thought many of them, leave things alone, especially as success was in their view doubtful, and even if realised might mean the loss of some existing privilege. Exactly the same indifference, and even greater resistance, have many Jews shown toward Zionism. Exactly in the same way will their indifference and resistance be overcome. A conquering idea is the return to Zion! Moreover, the Zionist pioneers

of the first hour, and those of to-day, are imbued with the spirit and purpose that win! Those who have themselves been something of pioneers, privileged too to see an accomplished victory, can recognise the purposeful pioneer in others—a characteristic or characteristics, which one need not, perhaps cannot, define, but are unmistakable. Herzl's memoirs contain certain sayings which, to the discerning, overflow with meaning. They record his hopes and intents for Zion, and, what is more, those first many efforts and few achievements which seem so petty to onlookers, but are in truth, the great, because indispensable foundation stones of any successful movement, and the very assurance of its future triumph. It is a certain patience in the day of small, preliminary things and his sense of their being ultimately important, and therefore immensely worth doing, that mark Herzl as a leader, whose work was bound, even after his death, to issue in victory.

Since 1917, the door to success has been wide open, but even before Turkey plunged into the Great War, before the British campaign in Palestine, before the taking of Jerusalem, and then of all Palestine, it was enough to see Zionism at work among American Jewry, the strongest in the world as to numbers and wealth, to know that

success must come. In that campaign, doubt and opposition were destined to go under, because in spite of everything, Zionism has an ally in every Jewish heart, and because the Zionists are charged with a conquering zeal and inspiration—and not least the Deborahs among them. Indeed, it was the Deborahs who, in a chance and slight glimpse of the movement, were, to an outside observer, the decisive sign and demonstration of its immense potentiality. The part of women, in a national revival, in stimulating and sustaining enthusiasm and hope, can be, evidently, most important.

Once the Promised Land was set free and reopened to the Jews as their national home—all was, humanly-speaking, assured. The Jews had only to walk into the old family dwelling, abandoned in haste and by compulsory ejectment, long centuries ago.

A stony unfertile land, you say! What a feeble argument! A land flowing with milk and honey, it was, long centuries ago, before ever an Israelite set foot in it! If Canaanites could make the Land all fruitfulness in their far-off day, surely modern Jews with modern science and machinery and all the world's resources at their command, can still more easily restore its fruitfulness.

Obstruction or want of co-operation on the part

of the Mandatory Power is one complaint, but whether well or ill founded, not much to the point —because twelve or fourteen million Jews, controlling between them a very large share of the world's wealth, could amply finance the whole of Palestine without hurting their pockets, but to their own great advantage in every sense. But this hesitancy and reluctance to enter into the Land, at the moment of golden opportunity, happened once before and more markedly! Many difficulties in Palestine, arising since 1917 could have been averted by a stronger Jewish entering into possession of the Land when the door was opened. Arab opposition, one of these difficulties, is being gradually disarmed, and Arab confidence gradually won, we hear, but a swifter and more imposing Jewish re-entry at the first possible moment after the Balfour Declaration would have done more than anything to impress the Arab—and thus win his goodwill. All honour to the intrepid and devoted Jews who did enter in, and in the past decade have laboured, as it were, with their bare hands, to break up the hard, neglected soil and bring back its lost fertility. For love of Zion what have they not suffered and achieved! Their spirit means more than all the millions of Jewish finance in the upbuilding of Zion. Again,

the testimony of Gentile travellers to Palestine that Jewish children, born and bred in their own Promised Land, transformed out of the image of so many of their little brethren of the ghetto, can't be surpassed for beauty and rosy health, is a proof, such as Jewish millions of money could never give, that the Land will be Jewish. And the Jewish millions of money are coming also! Herzl aimed at that. Zionism as a spiritual ideal needed, in his reckoning, this material support. But each had to come in its order—the spiritual, the idealistic first, the material after. So, more and more Jews of wealth have lent their aid. One after another, they have identified themselves by name with the enterprise of re-establishing a Jewish national life and home in Palestine, and then have given of their wealth. To begin with, they have made gifts to the Zionist funds, to health centres, to the Hebrew University, and the like, but as Sir Gilbert Parker, after a visit to Palestine, sapiently remarked, what is equally, if not more, necessary is the investment of large capital sums in the agriculture and industry of Palestine. This point, also, has at last been reached and leading Jews of vast business capacity and wealth are taking in hand the development of the country. These able and power-

ful moderns will readily equal and excel what their own forebears, and the alien predecessors of those forebears, did in and with the land.

All the Jews in the world cannot live in Palestine, is one favourite anti-Zionist argument, but the Zionists do not seem to expect that they will. Sir Alfred Mond, for instance, speaks of Palestine being eventually able to support two to four million Jews. The Zionist objective as defined by Dr. Weizmann in addressing the Council of Ten during the Great War, is to make Palestine Jewish as England is English. "From the nucleus of a Jewish National Home," says the London *Jewish Chronicle,* organ of British Jewry, "if the foundations be well and truly laid, we have no hesitation in picturing that great ultimate National triumph of the Jewish People when their ancient land will be restored, and they, as Jews, politically emancipated and redeemed." Even though a minority of Jews live within Palestine, and a majority live in other lands, Palestine can, all the same, be the Jewish National Home—just as Greece, for example, would be the national home of the Greeks, even though more Greeks lived abroad than at home.

"They won't go there: they would rather stay where they are, at ease," is often said. But even

if only a few return to Zion, it is a sign of the times! Already more Jews have returned than in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, yet the Bible makes so much of that return which, indeed, proved to be important, historically, and not least because, as its sequel, the Jewish people were in Zion at the time of the Nativity of Messiah and of His royal if lowly entry into Jerusalem, and when, brought as a lamb to the slaughter, He poured out his soul unto death. . . .[1]

"Jews don't want to go to Palestine themselves: each prefers that other Jews should go," is a taunt with a double edge, because how many Britons there are who glory in the Empire and, being persuaded that the Old Country is over-populated and the Dominions under-populated, think it urgent, for the Empire's sake, that numbers shall emigrate! Yet they do not go themselves, because they are not young enough, not strong enough, or they are well-settled and comfortable where they are, although the Dominions, thanks to those who went there first, are far more habitable than is Palestine, after centuries of misrule and neglect. Americans, too, for all the "Go west, young man, go west," did not go in crowds to cultivate the Californian desert—though now

[1] Isaiah, chapter 53.

that the few have made California livable and luxurious, masses of them go, especially when it is cold in other places. Talking of California suggests one of the things that will happen in Palestine, especially as air travel with its rapidity develops. Jews of wealth with big interests and concerns in other lands, will arrange to have houses in Palestine as winter homes, and live there part of the year, and even rear and educate their children there: already it has been proposed to make the Telaviv Coast "a rival to the Riviera." As to the poorer Jews and those of Eastern and Central Europe especially, Palestine will draw them like a magnet when the practical possibility of existence there increases.

The fact of the Arab majority, so argue critics, prevents the triumph of Zionism in Palestine. It is true that after twenty centuries of enforced absence, the Jews return to find their country largely populated by others. Yet the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob will, in His own time, order things in His own wise fashion. Meantime the Arab-Jewish relations have been improved, according to impartial witnesses, of whom one emphasises the distinct boon that the Zionist policy has been to "the fellaheen who constitute the vast majority of the Arab population,"

and the disposition even of the landowners and effendi class to co-operate constructively with the Jews for the benefit of the country. The Arab monarch, Feisal of Iraq, is of goodwill toward Zionism, say the Zionist leaders, and approves co-operation between these two branches of the Semitic people.

A drastic and remarkable way out of the Arab difficulty has been suggested by the London *Jewish Chronicle*. It is that Zionists shall claim and concentrate upon a *part*, not the whole, of Palestine as the Jewish National Home in the strict sense. Here is the case as it was argued by the *Jewish Chronicle:*

> "Why should not Zionists seek means whereby a definite portion of Palestine could become a Jewish Commonwealth, the National Home for the Jewish people? They could concentrate on that portion of the land and put into it intensive work. . . . It seems to be the only method having regard to all circumstances, for preserving the National idea and bringing it to fruition. After all, the Jewish State which was destroyed by the Romans, was a mere province of Palestine. Yet its influence was worldwide,

enduring even to this day. The Jews have not been the only people who have given to the world the advantages of a splendid culture and earned for themselves the undying gratitude of mankind, with a tiny territory as the centre of their national being. But the territory, however small, was recognised as nationally distinctive. That is the essential point; and to secure that in substance, should be the objective of Zionism."

This reliance upon Roman Imperial precedent and the looking back to the times and customs of the first advent is quite interesting.

The much mentioned "economic crisis" in Palestine (as though even long settled and industrially powerful nations had not known economic difficulty and much unemployment!) was largely due to the eager inrush of Jews, before the country was prepared to receive them. Now that a group of the world's leading Jews are taking Palestine's economic affairs in hand, the Land will be made ready to receive and maintain an increasing Jewish population and this will strengthen incalculably the political side of the movement. In his epoch-making manifesto, *The Jewish State*, Herzl contemplated the formation of two bodies,

the Society of Jews and the Jewish Company. The first of these was to be the political agent in founding the Jewish State in Palestine, and the Jewish Company was to deal with the economic side of things. The political branch of Zionism was, in 1917, ahead of the other, and obtained the Balfour Declaration. But the economic branch lagged behind and in consequence some ground was lost, because behind political policy, even so skilfully pursued as by Dr. Weizmann, there must always be *power,* whether of wealth or of force. But, not too late to mend, the economic strong men of world-Jewry are now coming forward to play their part. Beginning in 1928, Sir Alfred Mond, Mr. Louis Marshall, Dr. Oscar Wasserman, and others took active measures toward new and more economic action. Palestine has great economic prospects, especially after the laying of the oil pipe lines to Haifa, declares Sir Alfred Mond, now Lord Melchett, and addressing the Italian Pro-Palestine Society, when in Rome, he said:

> "I have been in Palestine three times, and each time I have come back with greater faith and more enthusiasm than before. Jews from all countries have created in

> Palestine a new Jewish social order; there is a new Jewish youth, spiritually sound and physically developed, which, regardless of all difficulties, is successfully working the land. The stiff-neckedness with which the Jews are reproached, has in Palestine helped them to overcome all difficulties and to secure excellent results. Palestine has a great future before it. The construction of the Haifa harbour, the realisation of the gigantic Rutenberg electrification scheme, and the new industries will justify the investments of large sums of capital in Palestine. It will be possible to transplant to Palestine, two million productive Jews and to create a new individual Jewish culture on sound foundations."

Over and above all that, the Dead Sea with its mineral deposits may be enormously wealth-productive, some say, but whether or no the Dead Sea is a gold sea, in the sense that its stores will be of export value, this much is certain, they will avail to fertilise the soil of Palestine and make it fruitful indeed. Out of the Dead Sea will thus come life for the Land. The future of Palestine economically speaking, is assured and prosperous.

The revival of Hebrew as the Jewish mother

tongue and common speech of Palestine is quite marvellous, and a proof of the sincerity and reality of the Jewish home-going. The founding of the Hebrew University proves this same intention to hold Palestine for good. The establishing of schools and the battle against disease and conditions producing disease—all that puts any Gentile scoffer to shame. Very much Jewish activity, financed as it is by the Jews of the world, benefits the Mandatory Power and the entire population, Gentiles and Arabs as well as Jews.

The religious aspect of Jewish life in Zion regained is of pre-eminent importance. The returning Jews are of all shades of belief and unbelief in the faith of their fathers. For many, Zionism is a racial, without being a religious, movement. The ancient scenes and associations of Palestine are waking in many the former reverence for, even if not all the former belief in, matters Biblical. Others are reverting to the ways and beliefs of old: those who never left them hold to them more fervently.

The Temple and the ancient sacrifices interrupted in 70 A.D., what of these! Devout and orthodox Jews doubtless believe that now they are back in the Promised Land, the sacrifices should be resumed in a rebuilt Temple. Rumours

have been afloat of which the following newspaper communique is representative:

JEWS TO REVIVE THE BURNT OFFERING

Move of Ultra-Orthodox in Palestine

"I am informed that a number of ultra-orthodox Jews are anxious to revive the burnt offering ritual, and have approached a prominent local solicitor to persuade the Moslem authorities to allow the sacrifice of rams and bullocks on Mount Moriah, the traditional altar of burnt offerings, on which the Mosque of Omar now stands.

A small sect of ritual butchers in Hebron are believed to be secretly practising the sacrifices in the hope that the day is near when this worship will be sanctioned publicly."

A more reliable indication of the feeling regarding the Temple and sacrifices among a section of Jewry is this statement, made in January 1928, in reply to a correspondent, by the editor of the London *Jewish World*.

"I am sure that a much larger number of our people than he supposes look for the

> restoration of the Temple Sacrifices. And whatever may be thought about the belief, those who cling to it should not in any way be blamed. Remember: the authorised Prayer-Book compels those who use it to pray for the re-institution in a re-built Temple of the Levitical ordinances."

All that is happening in Palestine is in fulfilment of what was foretold by the prophets, from Moses to Malachi, claims the Zionist leader, Nahum Sokolov.

Seeing is believing, certainly holds good here, because history and prophecy have so exactly matched, in the long experience of the Jewish people. Without any contradiction it can be said that the Bible prophecies concerning the Jew are, quite literally, history before it has happened. Therefore, students of prophecy foreknew and foresaid to all who would listen that the Jews would return to Palestine. And they said it when the Empire of the Turks still stood in the way and when the Powers, if not for very rivalry among themselves, then for fear of disturbing the world's peace, would not have ruffled a hair of the Sultan's head, or caused him the faintest shadow of annoyance for the sake of restoring any of the millions of Jews now or to be on earth,

to their ancient national home, promised them by God. In those pre-war days, when the Jewish people's national home was still bolted and barred against them, a simple woman in the Far West of America, infinitely more prescient, because she believed in prophecy, than any of the world's statesmen, wrote these verses on the "Return of the Jews":

"Back to Palestine they must go
Whether the Sultan wills it or no
Because the word of the Lord says so.

"It matters not what 'The Powers' say
A *greater* Power prepares the way
And who shall His hand and purpose stay.

"All that the Hebrew prophets bold
Of Israel's future lot foretold,
Must be fulfilled as declared of old."

This present wonder of ancient prophecy actually and visibly in course of fulfilment, stirs Gentile visitors to Palestine even in spite of themselves: they feel that the Zionist reclamation of the Promised Land is far more than a material enterprise on a par with ordinary colonisation. French writers, with the logical mentality of their race,

have been foremost in recognising the relation between the words of the prophets and the facts of Zionism. An admission that the present return to Zion does go to fulfil prophecy is made by one of these [1] in a book descriptive of his visit to Palestine. He begins:

> "An astonishing human and social experiment, without precedent in history, is being pursued in Palestine. Men of the old race of Israel, wandering since the far-away epoch when it was driven out from the country where it had developed, have retrodden, in the inverse sense, the distance travelled formerly by their fathers on the roads of migration. . . . In truth, since the dark days of the Exodus, the dispersed Jews ceased not to turn their eyes toward this lost land, to stretch out their hands toward it, to call with all their longing, for the moment when they might again. . . ."

Recalling the pre-war rise of Zionism, the same writer proceeds:

> "But would it not have needed, in order that the dispersed ones should return to Zion, that the world should be upset by convulsions

[1] Pierre la Mazière in *Israel sur la Terre des Ancetres.*

> compared to which all vicissitudes it has ever known would have been but the shivers of a benign fever!"

Well, says he, "by these convulsions the world was shaken during four years. . . . It is only through this immense cataclysm that the dream of the visionaries could be realised"—these visionaries who, guided by the ancient prophets of Israel, with their "mysterious gift of foreseeing, from a very distant time, the most unforeseeable events," had "announced the imminence of that return and that establishment upon the Biblical soil."

With unbounded enthusiasm another witness of Zionism in practice, M. J. Kessel, in his *Beloved Land of Palestine,* writes:

> "There is in Zionist Palestine a veritable deification of work. They work for work's sake. While the modern world is suffering from a detachment from work, in Palestine they passionately devote themselves to work."

And again:

> "They have undertaken an adventure unique in history, that of resuscitating both

> a people and its fatherland, of restoring health to a race and to a soil, of bringing back to a land quitted two thousand years ago, men marked by the seal of a score of nations and a score of centuries. This adventure is too marvellous to fail."

Remarkable is the fact, too often ignored, but emphasised by M. Kessel, that "in *less than thirty years* the Zionist ideal, which used to seem a chimera, finds itself on the way to realisation." The prophetic aspect of Zionism, too, he emphasises in the following terms:

> "Never did the Jewish conscience lose the remembrance of the Promised Land, for centuries has been repeated 'next year in Jerusalem.' It was a hope so constant, so strong, that it was able to keep intact a people dispersed for two thousand years. Religion played here the rôle of nationalism. While war-like religions have sought to realise themselves by sword and fire, this one expects everything through miracle. The Messiah is to come. . . . Meantime certain Jews who wished not to let the race disappear by assimilation, 'nor to wait till the

coming of Messiah, dreamed of a Jewish State.'"

To this aspiration Herzl gave precise form, yet the prospect of regaining the Promised Land seemed to many still "as nebulous as the coming of Messiah," but those who believed that the Gentiles would grant the right of re-entry to the Promised Land "were right."

Right, and still more right, are they who await the coming of Messiah, who is indeed heralded by this very reassembly of Jews in Zion. The beginning of Zionism signalled the imminence of Messiah's coming.

Some recognised the sign! The Christian ally of Herzl was one who did. Herzl has told how there called upon him "the Rev. William H. Hechler, Chaplain to the British Embassy in Vienna who was quite enthusiastic about my solution . . . when he had read my book he hurried at once to the ambassador, Monson, and said to him: 'The predicted moment has arrived.' Hechler declares my movement to be a Biblical one although I proceed rationally at every step." This visit Herzl returned.

"I called at the Rev. Hechler's rooms. Next to Colonel Goldsmid he is the most in-

teresting man I have come to know through this movement. . . . He displayed to me his Biblical treasures. Then he spread out in front of me his comparative history-tables and finally the map of Palestine. It is a big General Staff map in four sheets which was placed on the floor and thus covered the entire space of the room. 'We prepared the ground for you!' said Hechler triumphantly."

This same Christian friend and ally exerted himself to bring Herzl into touch with princes and statesmen who might further the Zionist cause. "He told them," records Herzl, "that the time had come 'to fulfil prophecy' . . . now he wants me to start for Karlsruhe with him to see the Grand Duke, to visit whom the Emperor is leaving Vienna to-morrow. . . . He sat with me in gentle converse—his burden: *fulfil prophecy!* He believes in it firmly."

Jews apprehensive of a recrudescence of anti-Semitism should realise that prophecy is the one sure bond between Jew and Gentile—in this sense that every Gentile who understands and believes Biblical prophecy is a friend to the Jews. Some Jews are under the mistaken impression that the Christian Gospel of Jesus Christ and Him cruci-

fied excites anti-Semitic feeling, but that is not true: it is the very contrary of true.

The truth is that anti-Semitism, though it may try to give itself a Christian cloak, is a matter of crude human nature, and if the situation had been reversed and the Jews had been a majority and thus predominant in the world, there would doubtless have appeared the phenomenon of anti-Gentilism. Anti-Semitism existed long before the crucifixion. Was Pharoah not an anti-Semite! Anti-Semitism would have existed if Christianity had never been heard of. Anti-Semitism exists, and most violently, among non-Christians. The one effectual prevention and cure of anti-Semitism is the knowledge by Gentiles of Biblical prophecy. That such is the fact appears very clearly in Sokolov's *History of Zionism,* in which is recorded the justice and friendship shown in succeeding centuries to the Jewish race by Gentiles who, understanding prophecy, have also understood the virtues and the failings of the Jews; have sympathised with them in their historic, long-continued vicissitudes; have known and foreknown what are God's dealings with and final purposes for this people—and above all have never forgotten that to the Jews were committed the oracles of God and that of that race, according

to the flesh was born the Redeemer King, who came before and is to come again. Therefore, Jesus and the prophecies which, as he claimed, testify of Him, are the Jew's real defence in a period in which the London *Jewish World*[1] has felt moved to write thus:

> "Zionism, properly understood, is the only hope that Jews have that there will not be reserved for them during the next two thousand years, a more terrible experience, possibly to the point of utter extermination, than that through which they have passed during the two thousand years that have gone by."

These are grave words, but not different from those of the prominent Zionist who was heard publicly to say that there is in this twentieth century a wave of anti-Semitism which may endanger the very life of multitudes of Jews. If Zionism is to afford them protection, that is one more great reason in its favour—but the fact should be recognised that the true friends of the Jewish people are those Gentiles who see the Jews and Zionism in the prophetic and apostolic light which shines out in that great eleventh

[1] November 24, 1927.

chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. These, therefore, understand that God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew, through whose fall salvation is come to the Gentiles, and they look forward to the day when the fulness of the Jews shall be the riches of the Gentiles, "for if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead!"

The best friends of Zionism among the Gentiles are those who believe that Zionism is to find its sure foundation, and to attain to its highest and final degree, when "there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer." Meantime, the Jews who are home again in Palestine would have found every door open and every path smoothed, if the prophecies were known and honoured among the Gentiles as they should be; in other words, if the ministers of Christ had in past years preached and expounded prophecy as they might have done. Because all the citizens, with officials included, of the Christian Mandatory Power would have seen in the return of the Jew to Palestine, both an obedience to God's will and a sign of that approaching uttermost fulfilment of prophecy, the Messianic return of the Redeemer. They would have known that by aiding the return of his

brethren, they were pleasing their Lord and hastening the day of His coming. . . .

If the world-mission of Christianity, as declared at the missionary council meeting in Jerusalem, includes the cure of race antagonism then, in this connection, the cure of anti-Semitism should be the churches' first concern, both because Christ's Jewish brethren according to the flesh have, as such, a special claim upon his Church's sympathy, and because the reproach of anti-Semitism falls, however unwarrantably, upon Christianity. Forewarned is forearmed, and if, as believed in some Jewish circles, anti-Semitism may presently increase, the churches can and should forestall it by insistently preaching the truths of prophecy and the coming of the one Redeemer of Gentile and of Jew.

The strange notion that we must not be "literalistic" in the interpretation of prophecy obviously cannot apply where Jewish future history is concerned, because throughout the past history of the Jews, the prophecies have been literally fulfilled. And how often reiterated they are, these prophecies, an *embarras de choix* when it comes to quoting examples! The first prophet who left any definite revelation concerning the dispersion of the Jews and of their ultimate restoration was,

writes a Jewish pen, "Moses, our Lawgiver." All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever. . . .[1] And if ye will not hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me, . . . I will bring the land into desolation . . . and I will scatter you among the heathen . . . and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste. . . . And yet, for all that, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them: for I am the Lord their God. I will remember the Covenant.[2] Here follows a Zionist commentary upon the foregoing and, as logic, it cannot be gainsaid.

> "It is impossible to understand how it can be said that this Covenant will be remembered, if the Jewish people is to continue dispersed, and is to be *forever* excluded from the land here spoken of. As to the return from Babylonian captivity, that will not answer the intention of the Covenant at all. For to restore a small part of the Jewish people to its own land for a few generations, and afterwards disperse it among all nations for many times as long, without any hope

[1] Genesis 13:15.
[2] Leviticus 26:27, 32, 33, 44, 45.

of return, cannot be the meaning of giving that land to the seed of Abraham forever." [1]

Future, still future, however near, is the full and final performance of the Covenant that the people shall possess the Land. Zionism from 1897 on to 1917 and ever since has been simply an advance toward the promised goal. The final trial, like the final blessing to follow it, has not yet come. Just in the same way, the final tribulation of the world at large, which is to precede the promised blessing of Christ's millennial kingdom, has not yet come. Short and sharp will this twofold tribulation be—the last crisis of the Age. This final trial for the Jews is predicted: When thou art in tribulation, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shall be obedient to his voice—for the Lord thy God is a merciful God—he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers, which he sware unto them.[2]

As the Gentiles, so the Jews, will be tempted at the close of the age, on the eve of the true Messiah's coming, and instead of waiting for Him, to yield to another the special trust and allegiance, and even the worship, due to the true

[1] *History of Zionism,* N. Sokolov.
[2] Deuteronomy 4:30, 31.

Messiah only; to exalt that other to the place that is uniquely Messiah's place. Yet as certainly as the Gentile nations will not fully become the Kingdom of God without that direct Messianic intervention from above foretold by the prophets, so certainly is the same Messianic intervention from above required to rebuild Zion surely and re-establish the Jews safely in the land of the promise. As it is written, "A King shall reign and prosper and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is the name whereby he shall be called: The Lord our Righteousness."[1]

[1] Jeremiah 23:4.

CHAPTER XVI

Signs of the Times: The Modern Policy of Nations

PROPHECY is wise before the event, concerning the Gentiles, as well as the Jews. It boldly pre-traces the main line of world history.

The historian of the Gentiles is Daniel, the prophet. Desperate efforts by certain critics to disprove that Daniel is a prophet have ended in smoke. His prophetic authority and his reputation for literary honesty have survived all their fuming. To-day's developments are endorsing his predictions: to-morrow's will laurel-crown him as the greatest of historians. Why has Daniel been honoured in the past by the chief assaults of "criticism"? Because his historical statements are so admittedly accurate, that if it be also admitted that he wrote them *before* the *event,* then the divine inspiration and authority of Biblical prophecy cannot be denied.

In charity to the critics, it may here be noted again, that they set to work in the days before

modern science had conceived of the future as presently existent—of there being "nothing to prevent a person from being aware of an event before it happens,"[1] should he possess the requisite power of vision. With their limited scientific horizon and their negative turn of mind, these old-fashioned critics could think of no better rule than this: to assume that every prophecy was, and must have been, written after, and not before, the events prophesied, an assumption that was neither modern nor scholarly. Furthermore, it implied imposture on the part of the prophets —a patent injustice and absurdity, considering the lofty moral tone which all, the critics included, are obliged to ascribe to the Hebrew prophets. The theory that Daniel pretended to prophesy events which in fact were already past, would make of his book a fraud and a calculated and elaborate fraud. Very poor psychology this, as appears from a reading of the book that bears his name!

One proof that Daniel was a prophet and did not write at the later time alleged by the critics, is that Ezekiel, his brother prophet, has named him,[2] and with reverence, as one of the very greatest among men. The argument of later

[1] Professor A. S. Eddington. [2] Ezekiel, chapter 14.

interpolation will not serve in any Old Testament connection. The impossibility of interpolations and additions is shown by the words of the Jewish scholars, representing the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the Jewish Publication Society of America, who have edited for Jewish use a new translation of the Old Testament. In their preface, dated 1916, they say:

> "As to the text and order of the biblical books, the present translation follows Jewish tradition, the Sacred Scriptures having come down in a definite compass and in a definite text. . . . With every step by which each of the three parts[1] was sealed, nothing to be added or to be taken away, the text was likewise fixed and thenceforth made the object of zealous watchfulness. Even with regard to the latest book of our Scriptures we read its text substantially in the form in which the great Rabbi Akiba read it, he who said that the system by which the sacred text was guarded constituted a fence about the Scriptures. In that system, at first oral and later committed to writing, the letters were actually counted and lists made, to the

[1] Law, Prophets, Writings.

end that no alterations should creep in at the hands of careless scribes."

One knows not what these Jewish scholars may severally say to the notion of some critics that the Book of Daniel was written by one who lived in Maccabean times and not when he pretended to have lived, but the question is how the Book of Daniel, was by false pretences, put over, under, or through the fence they describe as guarding the Scriptures. The imposture, however "well-meant" the critics may graciously suppose it to have been, would have been instantly detected by every Jew. When, how, by whom was this trick played: let the critics tell us! But their argument against the predictiveness of the Book of Daniel is puerile!

In any case, it could not destroy the predictive character of the Book of Daniel for us moderns, because the Book of Daniel contains prophecy which is in course of fulfilment in our own day.

Hold always in mind the Image given and interpreted in the second chapter, and you have the Danielic prophecy from beginning to end in its completeness and true historic proportion! All the rest is governed by the representation of the Image and its fate. Other chapters simply fill out this prophetic record at various points. The

Image is the epitome of history from the Kingdom of Babylon to the Kingdom of Christ.

From head to toes, the parts of the Image, each part made of its own stuff, predict and symbolise four great historic empires. Yes, symbols are used in the Bible, but they are symbols of realities. So this Image symbolised empires which have actually appeared in world history. The four empires in question are admittedly those of Babylon, of Medo-Persia, of Greece, and of Rome, and their history as foreseen and foretold by Daniel covers the period Biblically termed the Times of the Gentiles. The period began, as we have seen, with the fall of the Kingdom of Judah and the rise of the Kingdom of Babylon: it will last until the setting up of the Kingdom of Christ.

"Thou art this head of gold," said the prophet to the royal Dreamer, whose waking memory had retained, not the form of the portentous Image, but the awe it inspired. There is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king what shall be in the latter days. Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This image's head was of fine gold. Thou, O King, art a king of kings, for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. Thou art this head of gold.

Pleasant in a kingly ear must this have sounded. Nebuchadnezzar would have gladly heard more of it, we may be sure. Thy kingdom will go on evolving; it has thousands, perhaps a million or more years, in which to advance and develop—that's what the king of Babylon would have liked to hear. But Daniel was no nineteenth-century modernist; he was no evolutionary theologian—so what he said was very different and far more true! *After thee shall arise another kingdom!*

At the present moment, the civilised world is under no particular monarch, but is viewed as a sort of kingdom of Man, in a word, Democracy. To King Demos, there are some who blandly prophesy: "Thy kingdom will evolve and advance as long as the world lasts." But the Daniels of the day, unworthy to be compared to that other Daniel, yet true to his same God—these modern and minor Daniels say thus to Demos: After thee shall arise another kingdom—and it shall stand forever, for it is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ which He will in His mercy establish, even here on earth! And though Demos put his crown upon the head of a dictator, still there will be witnesses bold and faithful as Daniel, when, a

helpless captive, he predicted to his royal captor: After thee will arise another kingdom!

Three empires had their turn after Nebuchadnezzar's, just as Daniel foretold. Babylon fell before Medo-Persia, under whom the Jews made that historic exodus from captivity and exile which is paralleled in our own times, and took them, as it is taking the Jews now, to an eventual meeting with Messiah. Then came great Alexander, first Western master of the East, torchbearer of Hellenism, roadmaker for the apostles of Christ, Alexander who, in his mere human way, first foreshadowed in this world that great conception of a single dominion of all lands and all races, of East and of West, under one Lord and King, which will be comprehensively and perfectly realised in the forthcoming kingdom upon earth of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Rome was still to come—the fourth kingdom shown in the Image. "And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron," predicted Daniel, and it was! "Nothing like it had been seen before. The Empire of Alexander had lasted a short life time . . . that of the Italian city had for fourteen generations embraced all the most wealthy and populous regions of the civilised world and had laid the foundations of its power so deep

that they seemed destined to last forever." [1] Not forever, but till the end of this Age! And sure enough, the re-erection of the Roman Empire upon its ancient foundations is now taking place. This restoration of the Roman Empire is indeed a striking sign that the Age is near its end. It was foreknown and foretold by students of prophecy because, in the Book of Daniel, the Roman Empire is foreshown as existing in the final years of this Age.

Daniel's word is coming marvellously true, since the revival of the Roman Empire has become a political policy of this present day! Daniel's history of the Roman Empire, given in advance of events, goes thus: This fourth iron Empire would divide into two, corresponding with the legs of the Image, "The kingdom shall be divided," and again into smaller fractions corresponding with the toes. East and West divided the Roman Empire in historic fact, and into a plurality of nations did it divide later. Nevertheless, as an empire does Daniel see it still, its component nations again cohering at the very end of its history when, as the prophet foresees, it will be replaced by the Kingdom of Christ. The future historic fact of His coming to reign is sym-

[1] *Holy Roman Empire*, Lord Bryce.

bolised by the descent of "a stone cut out without hands," which smites the Image, and then, in substitution therefor, becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. . . .

What an astounding thing that this Hebrew youth, Daniel, was able to look down the vista of time and see the Roman Empire enduring to the end of this Gentile age! A master historian, indeed, recording events before they happened! Ordinary modern historians, Lord Bryce for one, have shown how the Roman Imperial idea and entity persisted until the nineteenth century. True, the empire had been shifted from its Latin basis to a Teutonic basis by conquerors "full of respect for the majestic power which had for so many centuries confronted and instructed them." Yet it was the Roman Empire still, for to quote one of its conquerors, "I chose the glory of going down to posterity as the restorer of that Roman power which it was beyond my power to replace." Indeed, Lord Bryce in his noted work on the subject named 1806 as the date of the empire's decease, and wrote, as its epitaph, that with the Emperor Francis' resignation of the Imperial Crown, "the oldest political institution in the world had come to an end" and that the empire thus "extinguished" was "the same which the

crafty nephew of Julius had won for himself against the powers of the East beneath the cliffs of Actium."

Yet reprieved and revived even then, was the Roman Empire, revoked was this sentence of death by Lord Bryce himself, for in a later edition and a supplementary chapter, he wrote:

> "In 1806 the Holy Empire died and was buried and to all appearance forgotten. No outworn shape of the past could have seemed less likely ever to be recalled to life. . . . Fifty years passed away . . . time drove forwards and the Holy Roman Empire seemed left so far behind that it was hard to believe that living men had seen it and borne part in its government."

Yet the empire still haunted the world stage. In Lord Bryce's judgment a "restoration of the Empire" took place in 1871 when the German Empire was founded. "Then suddenly," he writes, "there arises from those cold ashes a new, vigorous, self-confident German Empire, a state which, although most different, as well in its inner character as in its form and legal aspect, from its predecessor, is nevertheless that predecessor's representative." Napoleon had already tried,

though in the end vainly, to wield the Imperial sceptre laid down by Austria and revive the Roman Empire on a French, which is to say a Latin and a Mediterranean, basis. Still the Germanic hold upon the Roman Imperial inheritance continued, and in the Great War of 1914-18 Kaiser Wilhelm, with his "world power or downfall," made a gambler's throw to win a Germanic-Roman Empire mightier than the Caesars ever ruled. This was not to be: he failed. But amid the fire and smoke of war, arose the first beginnings of the reconstruction of the Roman Empire upon its original foundation—namely the Latin lands and Mediterranean Sea, with Italy more and more taking the lead in the reconstruction. Italy's first gesture emphasising her Latinity was to declare neutrality in a war involving a Latin people. Her second gesture was to enter the war on the Latin side. More decisive still was the Fascist evocation of the Roman Imperial past and Fascism's forward striving to restore the Imperial fabric, to renew the grandeur that was Rome.

The map of the world begins to show the Roman Empire again. The long-invisible ink of its outline begins, after centuries, to be newly visible.

Italy at the core, the lands that were of the

empire are once more clustering together. Latin reunion—the call for this is strong. A renaissance of Latinity, of the Latin peoples, is proclaimed. Civilisation, they say, will have its modern renewal in its ancient birthplace, the Graeco-Roman world, civilisation which will ever be centred and find its life-spring on the Mediterranean shore! The notion of "Latin decadence," it is argued, was disproved by the 1914 war, which demonstrated the continued virility, tenacity, and initiative of the Latins, as does their recovery from the destructive effects of the war, while Italy claims that by her national resurgence and by leading the way to a new social order, she is proving that Latinity has not lost its ancient world-primacy.

Certainly, Italy is, step by step, re-assembling the Roman Empire. Ancient Italy did, by force, much that modern Italy is doing by diplomacy—but the goal is the same. There will be a like association of peoples and lands. This was foreshadowed in the Alliance of 1914: it was foreshadowed by the Italian Duce's post-war plea for a balance of racial blocs, of which one must be a bloc of the Latin peoples. Why not pan-Latinism, echoed a European journalist, as much as pan-Slavism, pan-Germanism, pan-Islamism, and

even pan-Americanism! Latins, says he, have the same interest in, and right to, racial and territorial union as have others.

Now, as twenty centuries ago, Italy is again bringing together the lands surrounding the Mediterranean. Towards that objective, Italian diplomacy labours steadily, tenaciously, persistently. The other parts of the ancient empire grow increasingly disposed toward co-partnership. They hope for strength in union, and strength they sorely need in these unsettled times.

The clue to present-day international politics is the reconstruction of the Roman Empire which has, since 1914, been gradually proceeding. The map of the ancient Roman Empire will prove a very good guide to the result of "regional pacts" and other diplomatic movements of the day.

One by one, the Latin nations are drawing together and the ancient Mediterranean union advances to completion. The leader of Italy appeals to the Mediterranean powers to make a united front against all their common difficulties and dangers. This will eventually mean a modern reconstruction of the Roman Empire, filling the same place and wielding the same power in the world. Since the long-ago fall of the Empire, men have dreamed of, have longed for its return.

They have looked back to the time when "all civilisation was united under a single paternal government," a fact to which they "cling as if reluctant to give up the hope of one day reconstituting the unity they had lost." So writes an admirer of Fascism, who represents it as aspiring to bind together the national groups that belonged to the Roman Empire "into one genuine political unity." [1]

This looking backward to Roman days and ways for a modern hope and policy is a characteristic sign of the times. Some onlookers profess to discern even in post-war Germany a movement to reconstitute a sort of Germanic-Roman Empire, after the former model. The Imperial sceptre is, however, destined to return to its ancient tenancy in Latin hands, and the Imperial centre of gravity to where it originally was—the Mediterranean. For all the modern importance of the Atlantic and the Pacific, the very centre and focus of future world events will, as surely as in ancient times, be the Mediterranean. Prophecy plainly shows it, and we moderns begin to see it for ourselves. "The twentieth century, which was to have been that of the Extreme Orient, may remain in history as the great Mediterranean cen-

[1] *Universal Aspects of Fascism,* J. S. Barnes, F.R.G.S.

tury," writes a French expert on foreign affairs. In his preface to *The Mediterranean and its Problems,*[1] Lord Edward Gleichen not long since summed up the matter thus:

> "The kaleidoscope has shifted: the riddles of the North Sea and of the so-called Einkreisungspolitik have vanished and the Mediterranean Problem, with Germany merely in the rôle of a commercial traveller, has taken their place. No longer is the European coast-line the only one that matters. The African and Asiatic shores now contribute their quota of difficulties, and the Powers, partly regrouped, partly new-born, and partly re-oriented, vie with one another in adding to the confused mass of warring interests which will have to be disentangled before the reign of perfect peace shall set in. Spain, Tangier and Morocco in the West, France and Italy in the centre, Yugoslavia, Albania, Greece, Egypt, the Turks and again Italy in the East—with British interests involved in the whole question: who shall prophesy as to what will have happened before five years are over?"

[1] By Major Polson Newman.

The Bible alone enables us to foresee how events will turn in the coming years and by what means —by whom—the "reign of perfect peace" will be brought in. Sufficiently impressive, meantime, is the the fact that students of prophecy were able, long since, to foresee that in this latter phase of the age human policy would, as it is now doing, "conjure up the vision of an 'Imperium Romanum' restored under modern conditions" in "a great Mediterranean system, as in the days of the Caesars." . . .[1]

Beginning at the mouth of the historic sea, we find that Spain has entered into close friendship with Italy by reason of racial affinity and a common Mediterranean interest, not to speak of a certain resemblance of régime. Italo-Spanish friendship has crystallised in the Pact of Madrid, which provided a foundation stone for the reviving Mediterranean union, and has, as one comment went, "added a durable link to those which will, in an early day, unite the Latin peoples for the sure defense of their civilisation." A sensation in the diplomatic world was stirred by the Pact of Madrid. "A chain has been forged link-

[1] Expressions quoted from *The Mediterranean and Its Problems,* by Major Polson Newman.

ing Spain with Italy as she was not linked before. There is a new situation in the Mediterranean." [1]

France, thankful in war-time for Italian neutrality and afterwards alliance, drew apart after victory, but even then and every day increasingly, there was a strong unofficial demand for a Franco-Italian *entente*. This *entente* students of prophecy have long expected. Officially relations began to improve in 1927. Later diplomatic conversations, as well as the recognition of Italy's claims by the Tangier Conference, further advanced things. Far more important is Mussolini's appeal to make a Franco-Italian bloc of eighty million souls whose existence, so they argue in Italy, would be worth more than Locarno, or any other means yet devised, to safeguard the frontier of France and prevent war. Mussolini's own words in favour of a Latin bloc deserve record here;

> "If these peoples which have the same faith and which share the same civilisation can be federated, the peace of the world will be assured and a barrier set up against barbarism. I say to all Frenchmen: Any attempt to create a closer understanding between us and between the Latin races in general is worthy

[1] London *Times* Editorial.

of praise and encouragement. Italy and France are made to understand one another. Our civilisation, our culture, what a wonderful common heritage it is! With a Frenchman we can at once come to an understanding of a common plan; we see him a brother, someone who belongs to us. That is why the family of France and Italy may at times be immersed in a stormy atmosphere and pass through periods of squalls, but we shall never get as far as an open quarrel because we are brothers who sometimes dispute, but who love one another all the same."

The King of Italy's call for an ethnic alliance between his country and France was significant. France and Italy with eighty million inhabitants between them must, according to Mussolini, "march hand in hand as sisters affectionately united—united always, for united we are strong and to-day it is a crime not to be strong." The friendship of forty-two million Italians could be useful to France in many a case, has been Senator Cippico's argument, with this added as a peace policy: "If we could create the Latin bloc, which England would join, Europe would not be able to budge."

The same policy has been persistently urged in France. The royalists are, of course, pro-Italian and so doubly welcomed the royal marriage which forged a new Franco-Italian link. The alliance of the Latin peoples, Léon Daudet remarked at that time, "can and must be the saving of civilization." Pseudo-republicans, in large numbers, have longed worked for an *entente*. "A spirit of friendship and confidence must characterise the common efforts of the two great Latin nations." [1] "May the tricolors of France and Italy be and remain allied for the peace of the world and for the prosperity of the two great descendants of a common mother, classic Rome." Such are typical expressions of Franco-Italian sympathy. French newspapers such as the *Figaro,* the *Avenir,* the *Gaulois,* have long contended for an *entente* with Italy, saying: "This entente is indispensable to the safety of the two countries. . .a policy of Latin reunion is more than ever necessary." . . . Why not have taken the same pains to reach an *entente cordiale* with Italy as to the preparing of Locarno, challenged Gustave Hervé. Owing to the influence of such public opinion, Franco-Italian tension relaxed, under the benevolent eye of British onlookers, the London *Times* saying,

[1] The Paris *Temps.*

> "Nothing could be more agreeable to us as friends of peace, as the friends of both nations, and as ourselves a great Power with vital interests in the Mediterranean than to witness the conclusion of a lasting *entente* between France and Italy."

Thus has international feeling since 1914 been moving to the vindication and fulfillment of prophecy.

The Roman Imperial unity extended to the Balkans and will do so again. By warlike and peaceful means, and desirably and probably by peaceful ones, Jugoslavia will be brought into the same camp as Italy. The why and wherefore of the Italo-Albanian question—this becomes plain in the light of prophecy. Roumania has never forgotten and takes pride in her Latinity. A willing co-operator she, in reforging the ancient link. The Italo-Roumanian treaty of friendship and collaboration signed in 1927 after the similar Franco-Roumanian treaty, evoked this comment from the Paris *Temps*: "We have always supported a close regrouping of the Latin nations for the effective defence in every domain of their common civilization."

Another piece of the Roman mosaic to be fitted

in was Greece, and, sure enough, Venizelos, on becoming master of Greece in 1928, quickly made a treaty with Italy and entered into close diplomatic cooperation with Mussolini, saying: "My purpose is a pact of peace and friendship between Greece, Italy, Turkey, Jugo-Slavia and Bulgaria."

It is not only interpreters of prophecy who see a continuation of ancient Roman policy in the Italian foreign policy of to-day. This policy, runs one comment, recalls the brilliant epoch of the Emperor Trajan, it seeks to secure the collaboration of states bordering the Aegean Sea and the Black Sea and then to gain the basin of the Danube. The same writer adds:

> "The Italian renewal of friendship with Roumania and Hungary follows upon the treaties concluded with Greece, Bulgaria and Albania. This Adriatico-Aegean-Danubian programme was that of Imperial Rome." [1]

Half-way round the Mediterranean we are by this time, and how the links of the old chain are reforging.

Asia Minor comes next and we find that the Turks, who control that domain of Ancient Rome and seat of early Christian churches, became, in

[1] Professor Baldacci, University of Bologna, in the *Volonta d'Italia.*

May 1928, united by a treaty of friendship to Italy. Whatever the precise course of events in the closing years of the age, we may expect that Asia Minor will be, because it *was,* encircled in the revived Mediterranean confederacy.

Historic precedent is, as prophecy bids us anticipate, so faithfully carried out, that Great Britain, just as she was once part of the Roman Empire, is to-day involved in the renascent Roman Empire. For, as a Mediterranean Power, she will be, and is being drawn into the modern Mediterranean union. Not without meaning, from a prophetic point of view, was the British part and place side by side with the Latin peoples in the 1914 war. The peace terms emphasised and increased her commitments in the Mediterranean sphere, and bound her more closely to the Latin partnership whether she would or no, and whether or no she knew it! Post-war conditions are repeatedly linking Great Britain to the Latin elements in Europe.

The Anglo-Italian affinity is a very special one: There is ample historic and literary evidence of that. With special delight does the English traveller find himself in Italy. British and Italian diplomacies have flowed more and more in the same channel. England and Italy, according

to the Italian Duce, have now convergent policies in the Mediterranean, England having developed a concrete policy of friendship toward Italy and all the questions outstanding since the war having been settled, for example, those of the Dodecanse, of Jubaland, of Djarabub, war debts, the Abyssinian agreement.

Significantly enough, the memory of the ancient Roman connection has strongly revived in British minds. Roman remains have lately turned up from British soil with a strange frequency, as though to remind us that Britain was, and will be, linked with the Roman world. "We have a great deal more of Rome in our civilization and in our blood than used to be imagined," one London newspaper has observed, "the occupation was a solid one and the Roman-British population may have to be allowed to count for more in the racial amalgam, after the Saxon conquest, than has been supposed." *Roman Britain,* Mr. Arthur Weigall's work, has brought the ancient Imperial connection strongly to light, and the London *Daily Mail,* commenting thereupon, said:

> "To many quite well-educated Englishmen this is a new revelation. How few of us have quite grasped the fact that between

> the first landing of Julius Caesar and the fifth withdrawal of the legions four centuries and a half went by! Our Romans came from many regions, from Gaul, Spain, Hungary, Thrace, even from Syria and Armenia, to serve in the British Garrisons, administer British districts, and trade in British towns. They married native women and left an impress on our character and even our physiognomy which time has not wholly effaced. The greatest Empire of the modern world would have been other than it is if it had not been linked so closely and so long with the greatest of the ancient realms."

A twentieth-century Prime Minister has called his countrymen to witness what they owe "to those long years of Roman law, Roman discipline, Roman faith and partnership in a common Empire."

In view of prophetic indications of a renewed Roman Empire, it is at least remarkable that public opinion should have been led in these latter days to dwell upon the ancient Imperial connection, as though to prepare it for a return thereto.

From the Hellespont to the Straits of Gibraltar, every land along the Mediterranean is now in

some relation with the Latin nations and Great Britain. Even where mandatory or other control ends, or is contested, a treaty relation follows, or is in view. Thus the Southern Mediterranean situation is already a striking confirmation and fulfillment of the prophetic picture of conditions as they are to be at the close of the age. The visible tendency of the day is all toward fuller confirmation and fulfilment—toward making the Mediterranean, in a modern sense, what it used to be, a Roman Imperial lake, and the surrounding lands once again part of a common confederacy.

Modern Italian colonising on the Mediterranean shores is simply a re-colonising—it is a return to *Roman* Africa, a renewal and continuance of the ancient Roman task. Archaeology attests the fact by unburying "the dead cities of Latin Africa." For nearly three centuries, so we have been reminded, Africa (the term is used to cover modern Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Tripolitania) was "probably the best governed and the most prosperous part of the Roman world. Its political importance is shown by the number of Emperors which it produced."[1]

When Italy's King visited Libya—the birth-

[1] The London *Times* special correspondent.

place of the Emperor Lucius Septimus Severus—the London *Times* editorially spoke of "the Caesars who ruled all the Mediterranean coasts from Rome" and of the "particular interest" of Italy's modern return to the scene of "Greco-Roman civilization in Northern Africa." The work of Italy in Africa is "bringing to light the Roman Empire," by the editorial admission of the London *Daily Telegraph,* and though until now "the world had forgotten that it was once a treasury, a granary, a school of civilization and religion for all mankind," Europe is "at work there again." After students of prophecy have so long foreseen and foretold the renaissance of the Roman Empire, it is highly interesting to find the world recognising this renaissance as a developing reality!

Once again, the lands on the southern shore of the Mediterranean are becoming very specially a meeting place of West and of East—a Europeanised East, in some measure detached and differentiated from the further East by association with European peoples, across a common sea.

Students of international affairs will see the previsions of the Biblical prophets increasingly translated into current politics, and nowhere more markedly than in the Mediterranean sphere. And,

as happened of old, so now, the reconstituted Roman Empire will by its wealth, power and prestige and glamour, powerfully attract the outer world and will gain friendship and support from peoples far beyond its borders. To begin with, the Latin races are spread abroad in the New World—notably in Latin America and in French Canada. The United States, too, has, through many of its people, race links with the Latins of the Old World, without speaking of certain purely historic bonds of sympathy. All this will tend to a friendly relation between the Americas, North and South, and the great Mediterranean organisation of peoples.

To this great composite Mediterranean Power, strongly directed as it will be, those who desire world peace will trust, for the keeping in check of warlike elements. The Pax Romana will again —for a time—be the hope of peoples. The head of the great organisation will seem as Augustus Caesar, of whom ancient inscriptions said, "Augustus is the saviour sent to make wars cease and to order all things," through whom "sea and land are at peace, cities flourish in order, having prosperity, there is abundance of all good things, men are filled with hopes for the future and gladness in the present." It is impossible to doubt, as

one reads these words, remarks a modern historian,[1] that the people of that time had the feeling of a new and better order lying ahead of them. "War, extortion, misery end; a new era is dawning. The Empire was deemed the solution of a problem and even more a salvation. Religious feelings supported, and that religious feeling was one of admiration of the Emperor regarded as a present god, sent by providence for the ending of war and the saving of the community of the human race: here we meet once more the idea of the deified ruler. . . . It was the translation to the West of that tradition of the divine monarch of a great state which lived in the East."

This Golden Age supposedly brought in by Ancient Rome faded and failed: the idolised Caesar could not—no man can—fulfill the hopes of needy humanity. Prophecy foreshows this history exactly repeating itself at the end of the Age, which, as we can see by every sign and condition, is now so near. The only Golden Age will be the Kingdom of Christ when He comes, and He only can fulfill this hope and deserve the worship which none other may claim or receive.

[1] Ernest Barker, Principal of King's College, London, in *The Legacy of Rome.*

Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's but never the things that are God's—that will be more than ever a duty, until that day when God the Son returns, that he may add to His spiritual kingdom that kingdom of earth for whose establishing he commanded his people to pray during the time of His going away to receive His kingdom and to return. Honour to leaders who stand for order against chaos, who strive to hold together the good things that remain—often at personal risk and cost. Yet forewarned is forearmed against pride and self-exaltation, the sin ever besetting those who launch forth upon good works, the sin besetting them to the peril of their works and of themselves. "Thou wast perfect in thy ways . . . till iniquity was found in thee."[1] However truly "the powers-that-be are ordained of God"—that is only "until He come whose right it is" to reign, and the nearer His coming, the greater the need that the rulers of this world shall recognize Him openly and shall discern the signs of His coming with desire to surrender all dominion to Him. . . .

[1] Ezekiel 28:15.

CHAPTER XVII

"Know Ye That the Kingdom of God is Nigh"

THE world hankers after a well-being that shall be lasting—yet we know that the very best of human works has in it some flaw, some seed of decay. Therefore it is that the Kingdom of God upon earth will be of divine workmanship, displacing, as it must, both the worst and the best that humanity can accomplish.

The great historian, Daniel, foresaw "one like the Son of man" coming as that glorious One in later times Himself also foretold, "with the clouds of heaven"—unto whom was given "dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

The familiar prayer: Thy Kingdom come, will thus be granted by the messianic return and reign of God the Son. When He enters into His heritage of the nations and takes regal possession of the uttermost parts of the earth, then will end

the bitter struggle for existence and the spectacle of nature red in tooth and claw, the strife of men and wars of nations. He is the Prince of Peace. With righteousness will He judge, and His rest will be glorious, no man will then fear his neighbour for none shall make him afraid, and they shall neither hurt nor destroy in all His holy mountian, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord.

Hard to believe it, do they say! Not so, for there is the promise given through the prophet that "unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given and the government shall be upon His shoulder . . . of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David." The half is already done, for as the child of Mary, Christ was born in Bethlehem; as the Son of God He was given in sacrifice for the taking away of Sin and the giving of everlasting life. Just as surely will the rest of the promise be kept by His coming again to make the Kingdoms of this world His own.

Then, indeed, will seeing be believing and as it is written; The glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.

Emmanuel Library
Emmanuel School of Religion
Route 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

BT 885 .P2 1929 36379
Pankhurst, Dame Christabel
Seeing the future

BT 885 .P2 1929 36379
Pankhurst, Dame Christabel

LIBRARY
EMMANUEL SCHOOL OF RELIGION
ONE WALKER DRIVE
JOHNSON CITY, TN 37601

EMMANUEL SCHOOL OF RELIGION LIBRARY
MN BT885.P2 1929 363
Seeing the f ure, Pankhurst, C
3 0173 0001 4240
P9-BCS-367